

# SONOMA COUNTY

1956

## POULTRY EGG PRODUCTION

AND

## MANAGEMENT STUDY

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

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

ISSUED FROM--  
Farm Advisors' Office  
912 Santa Rosa Avenue  
Santa Rosa, California

-- March 1957 --

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

This is the Eighth Annual Summary of the current Sonoma County Poultry Management study. Twenty-two records, all from Sonoma County, cover the calendar year of 1956. 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 22 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 presents a part of the information available for public use.

## O U T L O O K

The year 1956 was a less profitable year than 1955 for egg producers. So far this year, it reflects lower egg prices. U. S. farmers' plans for this year are to buy 9 per cent fewer chicks for flock replacements in 1957. According to a new report by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, an over-all drop of 9 per cent is now indicated. This does not mean that this 9 per cent difference will hold.

It might be interesting to note that Congress has been requested to appropriate funds for the U. S. Department of Agriculture to improve estimates for poultry laying flocks and egg production. This comes as a result of much industry concern since a Census Bureau survey last spring revealed that the Agricultural Department had been over-estimating egg production in its monthly crop reports. Therefore creating the need for funds to do a better job of reporting.

The continued movement of large operated feed corporations and processing firms into the business of financing feeder cattle, turkeys, meat birds, and egg producers is causing concern among some farmers. This expansion will certainly have a bearing on the prices that you will receive for your products. The only hope is that many of you who are receiving this report will ask for help to increase your efficiency, since this is going to be a contributing factor in whether or not you will stay in the poultry business. In view of this outlook report, the poultryman who is making a living with poultry must do the most efficient job possible to continue in business. However, we do not believe that the efficient, wide-awake producer will ~~not~~ be forced out of the poultry business because of the many changes that are taking place.

We hope that this report will be of help to all of you and that you will be able to take advantage of the information that it contains.

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

Ser. No.	Income Per Hen					Cash & Depreciation Costs Per Hen						Net Farm Income	Non-Cash Costs Per Hen		Management Income
	Egg Sales	Poultry Sales	Manure	Chg. in Stock Invent.	Total Income	Feed	Chicks Bght.	Misc. Costs	Depr.	Hired Labor	Total Cost & Dept.		Family Labor	Int. on Invest.	
9	7.70	.31	--	.32	8.33	4.20	.39	.47	.18	.15	5.39	2.94	.65	.19	2.10
8	8.33	.67	---	---	9.00	4.65	.50	.33	.26	---	5.74	3.26	1.09	.27	1.90
21	8.89	.67	---	.55	10.11	5.34	.54	.51	.26	1.12	7.77	2.34	.19	.27	1.88
1	9.41	.71	.05	.18	10.35	4.79	.38	.44	.48	.03	6.12	4.23	2.11	.35	1.77
17	8.55	.75	.09	.08	9.47	4.73	.56	.40	.18	---	5.87	3.60	1.62	.23	1.75
3	8.18	.54	---	.99	9.71	4.78	.53	.24	.36	---	5.91	3.80	1.76	.34	1.70
12	9.10	.63	---	.15	9.88	5.26	.54	.33	.38	.02	6.53	3.35	1.43	.28	1.64
24	8.67	.84	.04	-.09	9.46	5.12	.52	.39	.30	---	6.33	3.12	1.21	.31	1.61
13	7.52	.69	.05	-.22	8.04	4.07	.30	.55	.18	.08	5.18	2.86	1.21	.17	1.48
4	8.35	.70	---	.22	9.27	4.99	.46	.47	.29	.75	6.97	2.30	.60	.32	1.38
6	8.87	.54	.04	.43	9.88	4.40	.49	.36	.51	---	5.76	4.12	2.42	.32	1.38
11	10.16	.61	---	-.31	10.46	4.62	.54	1.93	.18	.79	8.06	2.40	.81	.28	1.31
14	7.77	.67	.04	-.53	7.95	4.31	.56	.22	.26	.30	5.65	2.30	.69	.34	1.27
23	7.52	.48	.02	1.30	9.32	4.50	.71	.44	.31	---	5.96	3.36	1.80	.33	1.23
7	6.82	.34	.06	.28	7.50	4.36	.48	.40	.06	---	5.30	2.21	1.01	.15	1.04
18	7.54	.55	---	.45	8.54	4.44	.55	.40	.20	.57	6.16	2.38	1.53	.21	.64
29	7.65	.72	.04	.31	8.72	5.12	.87	.46	.35	.02	6.82	1.90	1.12	.36	.42
19	7.33	.39	.01	.72	8.45	4.88	.39	.53	.27	.02	6.09	2.36	1.73	.29	.34
22	7.64	.52	---	-.03	8.13	4.63	.47	.61	.33	---	6.04	2.09	1.51	.25	.33
28	7.51	.32	---	.19	8.02	3.95	.37	.54	.55	.12	5.53	2.49	2.02	.29	.18
20	7.65	.39	.04	-.28	7.80	5.09	.54	.47	.25	.03	6.38	1.42	1.04	.21	.17
16	8.09	.53	.05	-.71	7.96	4.60	.21	.39	.21	.18	5.59	2.38	1.99	.29	.09
Hi	8.34	.59	.02	.23	9.18	4.69	.46	.43	.27	.25	6.10	3.08	1.06	.26	1.76
Lo	7.86	.54	.03	-.09	8.34	4.52	.50	.54	.25	.24	6.05	2.29	1.25	.28	.76
Ave	8.11	.56	.02	.07	8.76	4.60	.48	.49	.26	.24	6.07	2.69	1.16	.27	1.26

Individual records are listed above in order of management income per hen, which appears in the last column. The first 11 records make up the Hi 11, or more profit group, for which averages appear at the bottom of the table. Notice that the Hi 11 sold eggs for 48¢ more per hen than the Lo 11. The Hi 11 had a management income of \$1.76 per hen as compared to \$.76 per hen in the Lo 11. There is a smaller range in earnings among these 22 flocks than ever before; from a management income of \$2.10 per hen to a low \$.09. In the farm income, the range was from a total, or net, earning of \$4.23 per hen to a low \$1.42. Some of this difference may be due to luck or chance but most of it can be attributed to management. Decisions pertaining to 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 results and profits.

TABLE 2: DISEASES ARE IMPORTANT - SEE RELATED FACTORS HERE

Ser. No.	Eggs Laid Per Hen	Fall Eggs Per Fall Hen	Per Cent Pullets	Per Cent Added July - October	Per Cent Mor-tality	Per Cent Chicks Lost	Culling		% Feed Mash	Size of Flock ***	Type of Floor	Disease or Troubles, etc.
							Per Cent	No. Mos. 1%				
9	233	75	91	25	21	2	55	9	52	L	Wd.Cem.Wr.	CRD-Fleas-Chl-Wrm.-Mites
8	248	85	95	43	16	18	102	12	45	L	Wire	Leu.-Mites
21	255	82	84	30	10	7	111	12	49	L	Wire	Cann.
1	263	87	84	30	8	2	105	12	58	S	Wire	Cann-Leu-Mites-C. & I. Coxi
17	234	74	100	44	10	5	116	11	49	M	Wire	Leu.-Colds-CRD-Mites-Lar.
3	251	80	80	43	8	4	69	12	52	M	Wire	---
12	248	83	87	45	11	3	99	12	56	L	Wire	Mites
24	212	69	72	52	4	1	127	12	45	L	Wd.Wire	I.Coxi-Cann-Blkh.-Lice-Mites
13	225	79	67	39	11	2	130	11	54	L	Wd.Wire	Bluecomb
4	228	75	100	24	11	10	120	12	53	L	Wire	Leu-Mites-Cann-Lar.
6	257	86	90	43	7	4	88	12	50	M	Wire	Mites
11	228	72	93	30	12	4	113	12	49	L	Wire	Cann-Par-Leu-Colds-Mites
14	218	70	86	43	16	16	130	12	53	L	Wire	Fl.Pox-Leu.-Mites
23	226	72	100	50	14	3	78	12	55	S	Wire	Cannibalism
7	216	64	72	41	11	9	82	12	47	L	Wd.Conc.	I.B.-Leu.-Mites
18	241	75	74	38	11	1	93	11	50	L	Wd.Drt.Slat	Bluecomb-CRD
29	224	78	100	100	7	11	130	12	74	L	Wd.Wire Fordan	I.Coxi-Blkh-CRD-Worms-Mites
19	220	74	74	33	12	1	86	12	100	M	Wire	---
22	224	75	98	74	14	3	86	10	52	M	Wire	Cann-Blcb-Leu-Lice-Mites
28	229	78	82	40	9	3	72	12	49	L	Wire	Mites
20	232	76	87	27	14	9	96	12	49	M	Drt.Conc.	C.Coxi-CRD-Lice-Mites
16	228	77	85	30	9	7	110	12	58	L	Wire	Fl.Pox-CRD-Mites
Hi	239	79	87	34	13	5	97	---	55	***Size: S - Small, Under 1,500		
Lo	225	73	80	41	12	9	105	---	55	M - Medium, 1,500 to 2,000		
Ave.	232	76	84	37	12	7	101	---	55	L - Large, Over 2,000		

The more profitable group got more eggs per hen and had lower mortality, culling, and replacement rates. If you will compare these records with 1955, you will find that the number of hens has increased about 100 per farm--with only #1 and #23 having less than 1,500 hens and the rest having either a medium or large size flock. The lowest flock size was 1,293, which is the highest number of hens reported as the smallest flock in the studies.

You will note in the percentages of chicks lost, the high profit group lost less young chicks. This year the average mortality is only 7.0 per cent for young stock. Of course, poultrymen never include the extra chicks above those reported when bought in their losses. We also have the second lowest mortality for laying hens, which is 12 per cent. You will note that the higher profit group has a lower replacement figure of 110 per cent compared to the lower group of 117 per cent.

Blkh - Blackhead Leu - Leucosis  
 Blcb - Bluecomb Lar - Laryngotra-  
 I.B. - Infect. Bronchitis cheitis  
 CRD - Chronic Respiratory Par - Paralysis  
 Disease Fl.Pox - Fowl Pox  
 I.Coxi - Intestinal Coccidiosis  
 C.Coxi - Cecal Coccidiosis Chl - Cholera  
 Cann - Cannibalism Wrm. - Worms

TABLE 3: 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	% Chicks Lost	Average Cost Per CWT of feed			% Mash	Lbs. Mash & Grain	Lbs. Feed Per Doz.	Lbs. Feed Loss	Grit Shell Lime-stone	Value of Feed Lost
	Died	Culled	Added	Repl.				Mash	Grain	M. & G.						
9	21	55	114	76	57.9	33.3	2	3.88	2.78	3.35	52	123	6.2	2.0	2.3	.07
8	16	102	110	118	64.5	36.6	18	3.95	3.11	3.49	45	132	6.1	4.7	2.4	.16
21	10	111	146	122	60.5	34.1	7	4.36	3.01	3.67	49	145	6.5	10.1	2.5	.37
1	8	105	119	113	65.6	30.4	2	3.88	2.90	3.85	58	124	5.4	3.2	0.5	.12
17	10	116	116	126	58.3	35.1	5	4.03	2.92	3.46	49	135	6.4	8.8	5.9	.30
3	8	69	118	77	56.9	38.1	4	3.87	3.21	3.55	52	133	6.1	1.5	6.9	.05
12	11	99	133	109	63.4	44.1	2	4.00	3.01	3.80	56	138	6.2	9.0	1.1	.34
24	4	127	123	135	51.1	32.7	1	3.86	3.14	3.47	45	146	7.9	7.2	4.2	.30
13	11	130	69	141	59.8	36.6	2	4.04	3.10	3.61	54	110	5.7	1.0	4.7	.04
4	11	120	129	131	54.5	39.8	10	4.39	2.62	3.56	53	139	6.9	8.2	5.4	.29
6	7	88	107	94	61.2	38.7	4	3.92	2.88	3.39	50	127	5.7	1.5	8.6	.05
11	12	113	109	126	53.8	42.0	4	4.35	3.27	3.80	49	120	6.3	3.6	6.0	.14
14	16	130	118	148	50.6	39.2	16	3.95	2.64	3.33	53	128	6.6	9.9	5.2	.33
23	14	78	122	94	62.1	38.1	3	3.81	2.95	3.42	55	118	6.0	3.8	4.6	.13
7	11	82	112	93	41.0	38.9	9	4.19	3.10	3.62	47	119	6.3	4.1	4.8	.15
18	11	93	107	103	54.6	37.5	1	4.02	3.12	3.57	50	123	6.0	1.9	6.7	.07
29	7	130	148	137	54.7	52.4	11	4.00	3.10	3.77	74	135	6.8	5.0	3.3	.19
19	12	86	114	98	44.6	33.6	1	3.88	---	3.88	100	125	6.6	5.0	0.5	.19
22	14	86	103	100	59.9	44.4	3	4.29	3.09	3.71	52	123	6.4	4.1	4.5	.15
28	9	72	99	80	45.0	36.4	3	4.02	3.00	3.51	49	111	5.7	6.5	6.4	.22
20	14	96	124	104	42.1	38.4	9	4.33	3.35	3.83	49	131	6.1	9.2	3.9	.35
16	9	110	101	118	49.0	32.2	7	4.44	2.96	3.82	58	118	5.9	1.0	8.5	.08
Hi	13	97	117	110	59.4	35.9	5	4.02	2.95	3.54	55	131	6.3	4.8	3.6	.17
Lo	12	105	113	117	50.4	39.7	9	4.13	2.98	3.62	55	123	6.3	4.6	5.1	.17
Ave	12	101	115	114	54.6	37.8	7	4.07	2.96	3.58	55	127	6.3	4.7	4.3	.17

Feed requirements were estimated from the amount used by the Seventh California Official Random Sample Egg Laying Test (based on approximately 850 calories per pound of feed), according to the kind of stock, with consideration for young stock added and young stock in the opening and closing inventories. This year we find the lowest feed wastage per hen: the Hi group at only 17 cents per hen; the low group at 17 cents per hen. This is the only table where a slight variation might occur in the figure of estimated feed waste. No doubt part of this is because some poultrymen choose to buy minerals in the feed rather than separately, as shown in table 3.

Higher production per hen is again shown by the more profit group compared to the less profit group. There are a few exceptions and their cost per hen was the reason they ranked above some of the lower ones.

TABLE 4: 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						Mgt. Inc. Per Doz.	Farm Inc. Per Doz.	
				lge.	Med.	& Small Com.	Whl-sale	Re-tail	Hatch-ing		Whl-sale	Re-tail	Hatch-ing	All	Feed Cost	Cash Cost			Net Cost
9	239	233	87	63	26	11	98	2	—	38	38.6	37.2	—	38.6	20.7	25.4	28.1	10.5	14.8
8	259	248	85	60	27	13	99	1	—	35	38.7	27.8	—	38.6	21.5	23.6	29.8	8.8	15.1
21	266	255	94	72	18	10	100	—	—	34	40.0	—	—	40.0	24.0	31.9	31.5	8.5	10.5
1	275	263	94	75	18	7	99	1	—	35	41.0	46.7	—	41.1	20.9	23.4	33.3	7.8	18.5
17	256	234	87	69	20	11	99	1	—	33	39.9	51.1	—	40.1	22.2	23.6	31.9	8.2	16.9
3	259	251	86	62	24	14	99	—	1	39	37.7	—	* 38.3	37.8	22.1	24.8	29.9	7.9	17.6
12	264	248	94	79	14	7	94	6	—	35	40.9	49.0	—	41.4	23.9	26.7	34.0	7.4	15.2
24	222	212	86	55	30	15	65	1	34	32	37.2	32.5	65.2	46.9	27.7	29.5	38.2	8.7	16.9
13	233	225	74	68	20	12	95	5	—	31	38.5	43.4	—	38.8	21.0	22.9	31.2	7.4	14.8
4	240	228	89	66	22	12	90	—	10	33	40.2	—	53.2	41.7	24.9	31.3	34.8	6.9	11.5
6	270	257	90	69	22	9	100	—	—	36	39.4	—	—	39.4	19.6	23.0	33.3	6.1	18.3
11	228	228	—	80	18	2	—	100	—	31	—	53.4	—	53.4	24.3	39.1	46.5	6.9	12.6
14	234	218	91	69	18	13	100	—	—	33	39.9	—	—	39.9	22.1	25.4	33.3	6.6	11.8
23	234	226	90	60	27	13	99	1	—	37	38.4	40.0	—	38.6	23.1	28.0	32.3	6.3	17.2
7	229	216	80	45	29	26	100	—	—	33	35.7	—	—	35.7	22.9	25.7	30.3	5.5	11.6
18	247	241	91	54	29	17	99	1	—	34	36.6	48.5	—	36.7	21.6	27.3	33.5	3.2	11.6
29	238	224	81	73	15	12	98	—	2	32	38.2	—	67.2	38.6	25.9	30.6	36.5	2.1	9.6
19	227	220	79	66	21	13	100	—	—	35	38.8	—	—	38.8	25.8	30.1	37.0	1.8	12.5
22	230	224	88	74	14	12	97	3	—	41	39.4	52.3	—	39.9	24.1	28.8	38.2	1.7	10.9
28	232	229	88	65	26	9	100	—	—	36	38.9	—	—	38.9	20.4	26.9	38.0	0.9	12.9
20	258	232	65	58	25	17	98	2	—	36	35.4	38.8	—	35.6	23.6	27.6	34.7	0.8	6.6
16	239	228	88	78	14	8	100	—	—	32	40.6	—	—	40.6	23.1	25.0	40.1	0.5	11.9
Hi	250	239	88	67	22	11	95	2	3	35	39.3	43.4	62.1	40.1	22.5	26.4	31.6	8.5	14.8
Lo	235	225	84	67	20	13	90	10	—	34	38.6	53.2	67.4	40.1	23.0	27.9	36.2	3.9	11.7
Ave	242	232	86	67	21	12	92	6	2	35	38.9	51.7	62.3	40.1	22.8	27.2	33.8	6.3	13.3

Egg prices are determined by size, quality, seasonal distribution, and channel of sale. Very slightly better egg grading was rated in the upper 11 flocks, which received 39.3 cents per dozen average for wholesale grades compared to the average wholesale price of 38.6 cents per dozen in the lower 11 flocks. Grades of eggs were considerably better in 1956 than in 1955.

\* Hatching eggs figured for own use (No.3)

TABLE 5: RESULTS BY 3 TYPES OF HOUSING

Ser. No.	Size of Flock	Eggs Laid Per Hen	Hens Per Pen or Cage	% Mortality	Ave. Price		Hours Labor Per Hen	House & Equip. Per Hen		Dollars Per Average Hen					
					Feed Per CWT	Eggs Per Doz.		Investment	Depreciation	Egg Income	Net Stock & Misc. Income	Total Income	Total Expense	Management Income	Farm Income
<b>CAGE FLOCKS</b>															
8	L	248	2	16	3.49	38.6	0.7	.27	.26	8.33	.67	9.00	7.10	1.90	3.26
21	L	255	1	10	3.67	40.0	0.7	.27	.26	8.89	1.22	10.11	8.23	1.88	2.34
1	S	263	1	8	3.85	41.1	1.4	.35	.48	9.41	.94	10.35	8.58	1.77	4.23
17	M	234	2	10	3.46	40.1	1.1	.23	.18	8.55	.92	9.47	7.72	1.75	3.60
3	M	251	2	8	3.55	37.8	1.2	.34	.36	8.18	1.53	9.71	8.01	1.70	3.80
12	L	248	2	11	3.80	41.4	1.0	.28	.38	9.10	.78	9.88	8.24	1.64	3.35
6	M	257	2	7	3.39	39.4	1.6	.32	.51	8.87	1.01	9.88	8.50	1.38	4.12
11	L	228	1-2	12	3.80	53.4	1.5	.28	.18	10.16	.92	10.46	9.15	1.31	2.40
19	M	220	2	12	3.88	38.8	1.2	.29	.27	7.33	1.12	8.45	8.11	.34	2.36
28	L	229	2	9	3.51	38.9	1.5	.29	.55	7.51	.51	8.02	7.84	.18	2.49
16	L	228	1-2	9	3.82	40.6	1.5	.29	.21	8.09	-.13	7.96	7.87	.09	2.38
<b>MULTIPLE CAGES OR PENS ON WIRE</b>															
4	L	228	25	11	3.56	41.7	1.0	.32	.29	8.35	.92	9.27	7.89	1.38	2.30
14	L	218	75-200	16	3.33	39.9	0.7	.34	.26	7.77	.18	7.95	6.68	1.27	2.30
23	S	226	40	14	3.42	38.6	1.2	.33	.31	7.52	1.80	9.32	8.09	1.23	3.36
22	M	224	22-30	14	3.71	39.9	1.0	.25	.33	7.64	.49	8.13	7.80	.33	2.09
<b>CONVENTIONAL</b>															
9	L	233	75-800	21	3.55	38.6	0.7	.19	.18	7.70	.63	8.33	6.23	2.10	2.94
24	L	212	500	4	3.47	46.9	0.8	.31	.30	8.67	.79	9.46	7.85	1.61	3.12
13	L	225	500-1000	11	3.61	38.8	0.9	.17	.18	7.52	.52	8.04	6.56	1.48	2.86
7	L	216	800	11	3.62	35.7	0.7	.15	.06	6.82	.68	7.50	6.46	1.04	2.21
18	L	241	200-500	11	3.57	36.7	1.7	.21	.20	7.54	1.00	8.54	7.90	.64	2.38
29	L	224	550	7	3.77	38.6	0.8	.36	.35	7.65	1.07	8.72	8.30	.42	1.90
20	M	232	600	14	3.83	35.6	0.7	.21	.25	7.65	.15	7.80	7.63	.17	1.42
Cage	2613	242		10	3.66	40.9	1.2	.29	.33	8.58	.86	9.39	8.12	1.27	3.12
Pen	3667	224		14	3.63	40.0	0.9	.31	.30	7.82	.85	8.67	7.62	1.05	2.51
Con.	3590	396		11	3.60	38.6	0.9	.23	.22	7.65	.69	8.34	7.28	1.06	2.40

It still looks like there are many influences on profit which are more important than the type of housing. You will note that with multiple and conventional hen housing, 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. There is still a question of what type of housing is best, but it seems to us that the man in business is more important than the housing.



TABLE 6: HOW WE COMPARE WITH OTHER YEARS

	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956
Number of Records	21	24	23	17	24	27	24	24
Ave. No. Hens Per Flock	1619	1734	1716	1784	1920	2293	2759	2856
Eggs Laid Per Hen	197	210	209	228	218	228	231	<del>323</del> <sup>232</sup>
Hens: % Mortality & Loss	21.8	16	14	11	15	13	10.9	12.3
% Culled	92.3	82	104	118	97	96.0	86.7	101.0
% Added	129.6	99	121	138	131	129.0	124.7	115.1
% Increase or Decrease	15.5	1	3	9	19	20	27.4	1.5
Ave. Price Mash & Grain per CWT	3.93	3.67	4.04	4.42	4.14	3.79	3.60	3.58
Pounds Mash & Grain Per Hen	141	128	138	146	144	135	135.1	127
Per Cent Mash	64	62	55	57	53	56	49	55
Hours Labor Per Hen	1.8	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.0
Average Price Per Dozen Eggs	49.5	41.9	54.9	48.6	55.0	40.7	42.8	40.1
Net Cost Per Dozen	45.1	37.8	42.3	42.3	42.3	38.3	33.3	33.8
Management Income Per Dozen	4.4	4.1	12.6	6.3	12.7	2.4	9.5	6.3
<u>Income Per Hen</u>								
Egg Sales	8.19	7.36	9.74	9.47	10.37	8.05	8.59	8.11
Poultry Sales	.67	.73	1.32	1.01	.95	.57	.56	.56
Miscellaneous Income	.22	.22	.30	.05	.03	.04	.02	.02
Inventory Change	.26	—	-.12	.28	.57	.43	.60	.07
TOTAL INCOME	9.34	8.31	11.24	10.81	11.92	9.09	9.77	8.76
<u>Cash &amp; Depreciation Costs</u>								
Feed	5.68	4.78	5.66	6.51	6.03	5.15	4.91	4.60
Stock Bought	.78	.53	.74	.78	.66	.60	.53	.48
Miscellaneous	.68	.45	.53	.48	.57	.62	.47	.49
Depreciation	.23	.21	.30	.32	.26	.27	.25	.26
Hired Labor	.25	.26	.38	.15	.17	.24	.22	.24
TOTAL CASH & DEPRECIATION COSTS	7.62	6.23	7.61	8.24	7.69	6.88	6.38	6.07
<u>Farm Income</u>								
Family Labor	1.51	1.12	1.11	1.06	1.55	1.45	1.20	1.16
Interest on Investment	.26	.24	.29	.28	.28	.29	.28	.27
MANAGEMENT INCOME	.73	.72	2.23	1.23	2.40	1.47	1.90	1.26
Egg-Feed Ratio								

The above study averages for Sonoma County for the last 8 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 1956 Study shows an increase in egg production per hen and a reduction in the percentage of mortality, as compared to most other years. With income per hen down from last year because of lower egg prices and change in stock inventory, poultrymen were able to make less in 1956 than in 1955. This could have been larger but because they were able to reduce costs and improve efficiency, this difference amounted to only 69 cents per hen while total income was \$1.01 less. Therefore, efficiency was increased 34 cents per hen over 1955.