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## Summary and Conclusions

This economic investigation of cattle ranching in Wyoming is designed to supply information to help ranchers with decision making. It brings out the influence of size of business, rate of production, efficiency of resource use, prices received and managerial practices on the earnings of mountain valley cattle ranches. Investment requirements, components of costs, returns and earnings are determined and reasons for their variation are examined. Also, the organizational methods and management practices of two successful ranches are analyzed and compared with the management practices followed by two less successful ranches.

The 60 schedules representing three ranch sizes were drawn from five different areas located throughout the mountain valley areas of the state. This study covered the year 1973, a peak year in cattle prices in the United States and Wyoming. The ranches studied were considerably larger and somewhat better managed than typical Wyoming ranches. They were strictly cattle outfits with no income from other sources. This greatly simplified the accounting procedure, as it was not necessary to allocate production costs between cattle and sheep. The 20 large ranches ranged in size from 1,100 to 3,788 cattle units (cu) with an average of 1,719 ; the 20 medium ranches ranged from 500 to $1,099 \mathrm{cu}$ and averaged

725 ; and the 20 small ranches ranged in size from 202 to 499 cu with an average of 382 .

Two definitions will help the reader understand the findings of this research: ranch operating costs include a depreciation allowance or charge for capital maintenane eand all cash costs of running the business except interest paid. Cost of production (sometimes referred to herein as carrying cost) includes ranch operating costs, plus an imputed labor wage of $\$ 7,200$ for the operator, plus a management fee of $5 \%$ of the gross income, plus imputed interest at $6 \%$ on total ranch capital. Thus, in determining cost of production, or carrying costs per cu, all cash and noncash items are included-all costs both direct and indirect.

The tabulation on the following page shows costs, returns and earnings for three size groups as well as statistical measurements in terms of business size, rate of production, efficiency of production, prices received and production cost calculations. These costs and returns are discussed in detail throughout the body of the report. Each ranch size made a similar rate of return on total capital after allowing the operator a reasonable wage for the labor and management. For example, the percent return to capital was $4.48 \%$ for the small ranches, $4.03 \%$ for the medium and $4.37 \%$ for the large ranches.


Developing stock water reservoirs and spraying for sagebrush control on foothill grazing lands are two range improvement practices which usually pay good dividends.

| Per ranch data | Averages per ranch for |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ \text { ranches } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 Small ranches | 20 medium ranches | 20 large ranches |  |
| Business size |  |  |  |  |
| Total cu | 382 | 725 | 1,719 | 942 |
| Total capital | \$455,700 | \$970,900 | \$1,965,400 | \$1,130,700 |
| Total receipts | \$63,610 | \$111,090 | \$264,300 | \$146,340 |
| Acres of deeded land | 2,232 | 6,165 | 11,820 | 6,743 |
| Man equivalent | 1.8 | 2.6 | 4.6 | 3.0 |
| Rate of production |  |  |  |  |
| Percent calf crop at market time | 89 | 85 | 83 | 86 |
| Efficiency of production |  |  |  |  |
| Percent death loss-cattle | 4.4 | 4.8 | 4.2 | 4.5 |
| Percent death loss-calves | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| Hours per ton of hay | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 2.8 |
| Cu per man equivalent | 214 | 293 | 387 | 298 |
| Prices received (per cwt.) |  |  |  |  |
| All livestock (av.) | \$50.91 | \$47.26 | \$47.33 | \$49.20 |
| Percent of sales from calves | 44.5 | 29.2 | 20.5 | 31.4 |
| Production cost calculations |  |  |  |  |
| Total cost (cash and non cash) | \$32,790 | \$59,250 | \$158.020 | \$83,350 |
| Imputed operator's wage | 10,380 | 12,760 | 20,370 | 14,500 |
| Imputed interest on capital (6\%) | 27,240 | 58,320 | 117,920 | 67,842 |
| Total production cost | \$70,410 | \$130,330 | \$296,310 | \$165,692 |
| Net beef produced (lb.) | 126,859 | 237,261 | 560,364 | 298,000 |
| Production cost per cwt. | \$55.50 | \$54.93 | \$52.87 | \$55.60 |
| Per cu data |  |  |  |  |
| Total ranch investment | \$1,193 | \$1,339 | \$1,143 | \$1,200 |
| Pounds of beef produced | 333 | 324 | 329 | 329 |
| Total hours of labor | 14.6 | 10.6 | 7.7 | 9.4 |
| Ranch receipts | \$166.52 | \$153.22 | \$153.75 | \$155.35 |
| Operating costs | 85.84 | 81.72 | 91.92 | 88.48 |
| Ranch income | 80.68 | 71.50 | 61.83 | 66.87 |
| Operator's imputed wage | 27.17 | 17.60 | 11.85 | 15.39 |
| Return to capital | \$53.51 | 53.90 | \$49.98 | \$51.48 |
| Percent return to capital | 4.4.8 | 4.03 | 4.37 | 4.29 |

To study the factors which influence profits on cattle ranches, the 60 ranches were arrayed from high to low based on the percent return to capital (see following tabulation). The 12 ranches, or the $20 \%$ showing the highest earnings had a
return to capital of $6.84 \%$ and a ranch income per cu of $\$ 93.28$. In comparison, the low return group earned only $1.61 \%$ return to capital, with a ranch income per cu of $\$ 34.33$.

| Coefficient | 12 ranches with the |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Highest return | Lowest return |
| Earnings |  |  |
| Percent return | 6.84 | 1.61 |
| Ranch income per cu | \$93.28 | \$34.33 |
| Ranch business size |  |  |
| Total cu | 765 | 936 |
| Total capital per ranch | \$838,400 | \$1,122,200 |
| Total receipts | \$135,390 | \$ 137,680 |
| Rate of production |  |  |
| Percent calf crop at market | 90 | 84 |
| Efficiency of production |  |  |
| Hours per ton of hay | 3.5 | 3.1 |
| Investment per cu | \$1,096 | \$1,199 |
| Price received per cwt. | \$52.50 | \$46.30 |
| Production cost per cwt. beef | \$48.18 | \$61.76 |

The highest return ranches, when compared with lowest return ranches, had the following characteristics: a higher rate of production, more cu handled per man and a lower investment cost per cu. They received higher prices: $\$ 52.50$ per cwt. for all beef sold compared to $\$ 46.30$ for the low return group.

The high return group had lower production costs: $\$ 128,314$ for the production of $266,300 \mathrm{lb}$. of beef, or $\$ 48.18$ per cwt. In comparison, the other group had a total production cost of $\$ 186,942$ for $302,700 \mathrm{lb}$. of beef or a cost per cwt. of $\$ 61.76$.

In obtaining field data for this economic investigation, ranchers gave excellent cooperation. They supplied information on quantities of beef sold by classes, labor inputs by months and jobs, feed requirements, as well as much detail on all monetary costs and income. By using federal cost
indices and based on input and output data obtained in 1973, a synthesized budget was prepared for 1974 for each ranch size. The sale prices received for the various classes of livestock in 1974 were applied to the quantities of beef sold in 1973. In this manner, the 1973 study was updated to represent 1974 conditions.

With the 1974 costs increasing by about $17 \%$ over 1973 and with price of livestock sold in 1974 less than $50 \%$ of the 1973 level, the budgets indicate that the cattle ranchers faced a difficult cost-price squeeze in 1974. The ranch income was $\$-5,933$ for the small, $\$-7,043$ for the medium and $\$-43,269$ for the large size ranch. Essentially, this means that each rancher worked for nothing, receiving no return for his capital and lacked this amount of having enough income to cover expenses. A section in the latter part of this report is devoted to this analysis.
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## Introduction

During the past 10 years the number of cattle and calves in Wyoming has increased by one-fourth-from 1.3 million to 1.6 million head, and the number of sheep and lambs has decreased nearly $25 \%-2.2$ million to 1.7 million (Table 1). During this 10 -year period, the realized gross farm income for Wyoming has increased from about $\$ 183$ million to about $\$ 433$ million. During this time the percent of gross farm income has increased for cattle from $49 \%$ to $63 \%$ and for sheep it has decreased from $15 \%$ to $8 \%$. This shows the relative importance of cattle and sheep production in Wyoming.

Cattle ranching represents the largest segment of Wyoming's agricultural income. High level management of the cattle ranch is important to security, production efficiency and finan-
cial success in the increasingly difficult and highly competitive range livestock business. Though there has been a slow but continuous improvement in beef cattle management over the years, the cost-price squeeze of 1974 as well as science and technology are combining to hasten the trend in recent years. Every segment of the industryfeeders, breeders, producers and packers are searching for and are examining different methods for producing and processing more and better beef at less cost.

A large herd of well-bred cattle, adequate deeded grazing and hay land, sufficient grazing rights from federal, state and private sources, and an adequate supply of dependable labor-these excellent resources do not insure profitable ranching operations per se. A cattle rancher must also

Table 1. Components of cash receipts from Wyoming agriculture.

| Year | Millions of head |  | Realizedgrossfarmincome(in millions) | Percent gross farm income from |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cattle } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { calves } \end{aligned}$ | Sheep and lambs |  | Cattle and calves | Sheep and wool | Crops, other livestock and government payments |
| 1964 | 1.3 | 2.2 | \$182.7 | 49 | 15 | 36 |
| 1967 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 227.7 | 55 | 11 | 34 |
| 1970 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 269.0 | 59 | 9 | 32 |
| 1973 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 432.7 | 63 | 8 | 29 |

[^0]pay the bills, meet the payroll, borrow money and execute a carefully prepared management plan. To do this successfully, like any other businessman, he must have experience and training; he must be informed on new developments and be alert to what is happening around him. The ranch will not run itself—vast amounts of capital are required, many important decisions must be made and the cost-price battle must be fought. It is hard work and it requires good organization. Careful attention to feeding, breeding, disease control and tight, keen management and planning are required to produce and market beef and to hold together vast ranch resources and make them earn even modest dividends.

## Objectives

An important purpose of this economic investigation is to supply information which will
help ranchers in decision making. Investment requirements and components of cost, returns and earnings are determined; reasons for their variation are examined. Specific objectives are to investigate the influence of size of business, rate of production, efficiency of resource use, prices received and management practices upon the earnings of mountain valley cattle ranches.

The organizational methods and management practices of successful ranches will be analyzed and compared with the management practices followed by Iess successful operators. Most ranch managers can benefit from studying and applying management techniques used by successful people. The annual carrying costs and rates of production as determined here are useful as norms or standards of preformance. Each rancher can compare his own operation with individual factors presented and thereby determine the strong and weak points of his own business.


These cross-bred Hereford-Angus calves have hybrid vigor which results in lower death loss at birth and perhaps heavier weights at weaning time with little or no discrimination by feeders who claim fast feedlot gains.

## Description of Area Studied

Range cattle production in Wyoming can be divided into two types-mountain valley ranches and prairie ranches. These types differ in geographic location, climate, crops produced, topography and methods of livestock management. The prairie ranches are located in Wyoming's plains counties east and south of the Rocky Mountains where annual rainfall ranges from 12 18 inches, falling mostly in the spring and summer. The winters are open, snowfall is light and winds remove part of the snow permitting much winter grazing. About one-half ton of hay is normally fed per cu, the greater part of which is fed to cows and young stock.

On mountain valley ranches, cattle are rum on the high mountain ranges during the summer season and on deeded and public foothill ranges in the fall and spring. During the winter the cattle are fed for several months on hay produced by irrigation. Cattle consume from 1.0 to 2.0 tons of hay per cu each winter. The summer range is cheaper but due to the additionol feed and labor required the wintering costs are higher than on prairie ranches. On mountain valley ranches, the useful life of cows may be one year longer and the percentage of calf crop is normally a little higher than on prairie ranches. When measured in terms of cost per pound of beef production, there is little difference in the two areas.

Cattle ranching utilizes lands that are largely unsuited to the production of cultivated crops. Native and alfalfa hay are produced in the irrigated valleys for winter feeding which enables livestock to make the most efficient use of forage on the rolling foothills and the mountainous grazing lands. The success of the rancher largely depends on the quantity of forage produced on the meadows and range areas. The rancher must plan the operation in a manner that makes the most efficient use of forage. Drought, short feed and erratic prices are difficult problems encount-
ered by most ranch operators. Mountain valley cattle ranches are subject to precipitation extremes varying from 10 inches on the lower ranges to as much as 40 inches on the high mountain valley ranges. The average precipitation in mountain valley areas is approximately 14 inches, but wide variations from the mean are common. Such wide ranges in moisture means also wide ranges in the available feed for grazing and water for hay production.

## Location of the Sample Ranches

This study deals with cattle production in the mountain valley areas of Wyoming for 1973. The 60 ranches representing three ranch sizes were drawn from five separate areas located throughout Wyoming (Figure 1). A sample of four large, four medium and four small ranches was taken from each of the five mountain valley areas. The Platte-Snake River area, located mainly in Carbon County in south-central Wyoming, includes ranches on the Platte and Snake Rivers or on tributaries which flow into these rivers. The Bear River area, mainly in Uinta County in southwestern Wyoming, includes ranches on the Bear River and its tributaries. The Green River area, located mainly in Sublette County, in the west-central part of the state is in the upper reaches of the Green River and its tributaries. This valley is bounded by the Wind River Mountains on the east, the Gros Ventre range on the north, and the Salt River Range on the west. The snowfall in the mountains here is abundant and irrigation water is available for the large and numerous hay meadows.

In the Big Horn Basin area, ranches are located on the periphery of the Basin-in the foothills of the Big Horn Mountains to the east or in the foothills of the Absaroka and Owl Creek Mountains to the west and south. The SheridanBuffalo area includes the eastern slopes of the Big Horn Mountains and survey ranches are located in the western part of Sheridan and Johnson counties.


Figure 1. Location of the sample ranches.

## Method of Analysis

This section discusses briefly the source of data for this economic study, how the resources were evaluated and how the ranches were classified as to size. Also, it will define several terms used throughout the report and will explain how the results are mainly presented in tabular form.

## Source of Data

The basic data for this research were obtained from a sample of 60 ranches located throughout five mountain valley areas of Wyoming. The operators cooperated by requesting their accountants to furnish the field enumerator with financial data. Information on livestock inventory numbers, land values, the extent of other resource holdings and information on management practices was obtained from the operator:

## Evaluation of Assets

Land value was based on productivity or carrying capacity and was treated consistently on each ranch and between ranch areas. Grazing land values ranged mostly from $\$ 50$ to $\$ 100$ per acre. Irrigated meadow land producing one ton of hay per acre was valued at $\$ 250$ per acre and land producing $1.5-2$ tons per acre was valued at $\$ 350$ per acre. Irrigated pasture lands ranged mostly from $\$ 200-\$ 300$ per acre with $\$ 250$ being the most common value.

Values were placed on public grazing permits held by the rancher. For example, the value of one animal unit month (AUM) on the National Forests or on BLM land or on state-owned land was placed at $\$ 25$.

The value of ranch improvements was generally taken from the rancher's records and his income tax returns. For example, the income tax return shows the new cost of the improvements and machinery, annual depreciation and the depreciation taken to date. From these data, one can determine current inventory values of buildings and improvements and also for power, machinery and equipment.

Livestock values per head, constant for both inventories, were uniform for all ranches and were as follows: cows, $\$ 300$; two-year-old heifers, $\$ 250$; coming yearling heifers, $\$ 200$; coming yearling steers, $\$ 225$; coming two-year-old steers, $\$ 275$. Bulls ranged in value from $\$ 400$ to $\$ 600$ depending on age, purchase price and the number of serviceable years remaining.

## Size Classification of Ranches

The ranches studied ranged in size from 202 to 3.788 cu and were larger and better managed than the typical Wyoming ranch. They were strictly cattle outfits with no income from other sources. This greatly simplified the accounting procedures as it was not necessary to allocate production costs between cattle and sheep. The 60 cattle ranches were divided into three size groups based on the number of cu. The 20 large ranches ranged in size from 1,100 to $3,788 \mathrm{cu}$ with an average of 1,719 ; the 20 medium ranches ranged from 500 to $1,099 \mathrm{cu}$ and averaged 725 ; and the 20 small ranches ranged in size from 202 to 499 cu with an average of 382 . A cu is the equivalent of one range cow weighing a thousand pounds. The proportion of one cu represented by all the classes of cattle is as follows: two-yearold heifer, 1.0 cu ; coming yearlings, heifers and steers, .67 ; coming two-year-old steers, .85 ; old bull, 1.40 ; beef cow with calf by her side, 1.15 cu . For example, 100 cows with their calves would represent $115 \mathrm{cu}, 100$ two-year-old heifers with calves would represent 100 cu and 100 yearlings would represent 67 cu , and 100 bulls would be 140 cu.

## Analysis of Data

The data are analyzed largely through a series of tabular presentations. Organizational characteristics, size of business, components of investment requirements, management practices and components of production costs and income are presented for the ranches in each of the three size groups. Many of these data are presented on a cu basis obtained by dividing the total figures for the ranch by the number of cu in the average inventory.

To study factors influencing earnings, data are presented for the high and low $20 \%$ of the

60 ranches based on several criteria: size of ranch business (number of cu ) ; rate of production (pounds of beef produced per cu) ; efficiency of production (cost per cwt. of beef produced or carrying cost per cu ) ; and prices received. A
case study is presented comparing data for two large ranches-one successful financially and the other less successful. A parallel comparison is made for two small ranches.


Breakfast time on the range. Most of Wyoming's hay is balod which makes it possible to haul to the range to supplement winter grazing.

## Organizational Characteristics of the Ranches

The organizational characteristics of small, medium and large ranches will be described in terms of land resources, livestock inventory numbers, components of ranch investment, labor requirements, business size, rate of production and efficiency of production.

## Kind of Land Resources

The average small ranch with 2,232 deeded acres included 1,544 acres of dry grazing land, 348 acres of irrigated pasture and 340 acres of irrigated crop land which produced 598 tons of hay (Table 2).

To augment home-grown hay, some additional feed was purchased. The small ranches had an average of 1,281 AUM's of grazing on public land and also leased 58 acres from private sources and/or from the State of Wyoming.

The average medium-size ranch included 6,165 deeded acres, controlled 3,001 animal unit
months of grazing on public land and leased 448 acres for grazing.

The large ranches included an average of 11,820 deeded acres of which 9,670 were dry grazing, 675 irrigated pasture and 1,475 irrigated crop land which produced 2,193 tons of hay.

## Livestock Inventory Numbers

## and Values

The small ranches had an average of 213 cows, 40 two-year-old heifers, 69 replacement yearling heifers, 42 steers, 14 bulls and 6 horses per ranch. In addition, two other beef cows were used for milking purposes (Table 3). Using the values per head shown in this table, the average livestock inventory was $\$ 105,950$ for the small ranches, $\$ 202,000$ for the medium ranches and $\$ 481,975$ for the large ranches. The large ranches were mainly selling yearlings and the smaller outfits were operating mostly on a cow-calf basis.

Table 2. Land resources for small, medium and large ranches.
(60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)*

| Kind of land resource | Averages for |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 small ranches | 20 medium ranches | 20 large ranches | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ \text { ranches } \end{gathered}$ |
| Per ranch |  |  |  |  |
| Deeded land (acres) |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated crop land | 340 | 603 | 1,475 | 807 |
| Irrigated pasture | 348 | 352 | 675 | 458 |
| Dry grazing | 1,544 | 5,210 | 9,670 | 5,478 |
| Total deeded acres | 2,232 | 6,165 | 11,820 | 6,743 |
| Leased land |  |  |  |  |
| AUM's on public land | 1,281 | 3,001 | 3,353 | 2,545 |
| Acres of leased dry land | 58 | 448 | 1,046 | 518 |
| Per cu |  |  |  |  |
| Deeded irrigated land | 1.80 | 1.32 | 1.25 | 1.47 |
| Deeded dry land grazing | 4.04 | 7.19 | 5.63 | 5.76 |
| Total deeded land (acres) | 5.84 | 8.51 | 6.88 | 7.23 |
| AUM's on public land | 3.35 | 4.14 | 1.95 | 3.17 |
| Acres of leased grazing land | . 16 | . 62 | . 61 | . 48 |

[^1]Table 3. Components of livestock investment for small, medium and large ranches.
( 60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

| Class <br> of <br> live- <br> stock | Inventory <br> value per head | Averages per ranch for: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 20 sm . ranches |  | 20 med. ranches |  | 20 lg . ranches |  | 60 ranches |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Av. } \\ & \text { no. } \end{aligned}$ | Investment | $\begin{gathered} \overline{\text { Av. }} \\ \text { no. } \end{gathered}$ | Investment | $\begin{gathered} \text { Av. } \\ \text { no. } \end{gathered}$ | Investment | $\begin{gathered} \overline{\mathrm{Av}} . \\ \text { no. } \end{gathered}$ | Investment |
| Cows | \$300 | 213 | \$ 63,900 | 383 | \$114,900 | 868 | \$260,400 | 488 | \$146,534 |
| H.2's | 250 | 40 | 10,000 | 83 | 20,750 | 187 | 46,750 | 104 | 25,853 |
| H.1's | 200 | 69 | 13,800 | 137 | 27,400 | 348 | 69,600 | 184 | 36,954 |
| St.1's | 225 | 42 | 9,450 | 106 | 23,900 | 309 | 69,525 | 152 | 34,274 |
| Bulls | 550 | 14 | 7,700 | 25 | 13,750 | 61 | 33,550 | 35 | 18,178 |
| Horses | 100 | 6 | 600 | 8 | 800 | 14 | 1,400 | 10 | 962 |
| Dairy cows | 250 | 2 | 500 | 2 | 500 | 3 | 750 | 2 | 598 |
| Total | xxx | xxx | \$105,950 | xxx | \$202,000 | xxx | \$481,975 | xxx | \$263,353 |

## Components of Capital Investments

The average small ranch had a total capital investment of $\$ 455,700$ with debts representing $\$ 46,100$ or $10.1 \%$ (Table 4).

The medium-sized ranches had an average investment of $\$ 970,900-72 \%$ of which was in real estate and grazing rights, $21 \%$ in livestock, $4 \%$ in power and machinery and $3 \%$ in feed. The investment per cu was $\$ 1,339$ with a debt of $\$ 143$
or $10.7 \%$ of the total. The owner's equity was $\$ 1,196$ per cu.

The average large ranch had a total capital investment of $\$ 1,965,400-70 \%$ of which was invested in real estate including deeded land, grazing rights and buildings and improvements. Livestock at $25 \%$ was the next largest part of the investment and the remaining $5 \%$ was in power, machinery and feeds. This is an average investment per cu of $\$ 1,143$ with a debt of $12.4 \%$ of the total.

Table 4. Components of capital investment for small, medium and large ranches.
(60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages per ranch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \text { small } \\ & (382 \mathrm{cu}) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \text { medium } \\ & (725 \mathrm{cu}) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 20 \text { large } \\ (1,719 \mathrm{cu}) \end{gathered}$ |  | 60 ranches (942 cu) |  |
| Deeded land | \$ | 264,764 | \$ | 603,532 |  | 1,247,780 | \$ | 703,681 |
| Grazing rights* |  | 32,036 |  | 74,968 |  | 83,820 |  | 63,608 |
| Buildings and improvements |  | 18,100 |  | 26,500 |  | 41,600 |  | 28,787 |
| Power and machinery |  | 18,650 |  | 35,100 |  | 49,825 |  | 36,247 |
| Livestock |  | 105,950 |  | 202,000 |  | 481,975 |  | 263,353 |
| Feeds |  | 16,200 |  | 28,800 |  | 60,400 |  | 35,142 |
| Total | \$ | 455,700 | \$ | 970,900 |  | 1,965,400 |  | ,130,818 |
| Total real estate debt |  | 46,100 |  | 103,500 |  | 243,500 |  | 131,008 |
| Owner's equity | \$ | 409,600 | \$ | 867,400 |  | 1,721,900 | \$ | 999,810 |
| Percent of debt |  | 10.1 |  | 10.7 |  | 12.4 |  | 11.6 |
| Average per cu |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total investment | \$ | 1,193 | \$ | 1,339 | \$ | 1,143 | \$ | 1,200 |
| Total real estate debts |  | 121 |  | 143 |  | 142 |  | 139 |
| Owner's equity | \$ | 1,072 | \$ | 1,196 | \$ | 1,001 | \$ | 1,061 |

[^2]
## Labor Requirements for Cattle Ranches

Work caring for and managing livestock is the largest user of labor on mountain valley ranches and represents about $48 \%$ of the total (Table 5). Main jobs associated with cattle were: winter feeding and chores, calving, branding, dehorning, vaccinating, castrating, moving and care of cattle while on summer pasture, roundup, culling and shipping. and general inspection and management. Since each of these ranches had little or no livestock hesides cattle, all labor costs must be borne by the cattle.
(rop production requires about $39 \%$ of the total and is the second largest labor input. The biggest job is putting up the hay. This means swathing, baling or loose-stacking one crop of native or two cuttings of alfalfa hay. Most of the hay was cut with swathers and baled and stacked in the field. The average yield was about 1.6 tons per acre. Miscellaneous or overhead labor required about $13^{\prime} ;$ of the total.

The small lanches with an average of 1.8 men and 382 cu required 5,563 hours annually. This is about 3,090 hours per man or 14.6 hours per cu. The crop work includes putting up 598 tons of hay from 330 acres of meadow land and producing. and harvesting about 10 acres of small grains (Table 5).

The medium cattle ranches with 2.6 men and 725 cu required an average of 7,694 hours. This is 2,959 hours per man or 10.6 hours per cu . About 995 tons of hay were harvested from 583 acres of meadow and about 20 acres of small grains were grown.

The large ranches were more efficient in the use of labor, requiring only about $73 \%$ as much per cu as the medium ranches.

The distribution of labor throughout the year on small, medium and large ranches is shown in Table 6. During the period of November, December, January, February and March, about $25 \%$ of the total yearly requirement of labor was used. During this period, the main work was feeding and caring for livestock and a little overhead labor on building and fence maintenance and


This incrpensive spraying outfit or dipping vat for the control of lice and grubs should be part of the managemont program for all cattle ranches.
machinery repair. During April, May and June, $30 \%$ of the labor was used. These were the heavy months for spring calving and spring irrigation of hay meadows. About 29 , i of the work was used during the heavy haying months of July and August and during September and October about 16 ; $;$ of the annual labor was used (Figure 2). This work consisted of finish up haying, cattle roundup and shipping. During the winter months, the period of daylight is relatively short. _rancher's workday probably was about 6 or 7 hr. During the period of April, May and June, the work sometimes amounted to 12 or 14 hr per day. During the summer when haying was the chief labor requirement and when seasonal hired labor was used, the workday returned to about 8 or 10 hr . During the fall about 7 or 8 hr were put in per man per day.
$j$

Table 5. Labor distribution by jobs for small, medium and large ranches.
( 60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

| Ranch job | Average hours per ranch |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Small | Medium | Large |
| Crop production labor inputs |  |  |  |
| Maintain irrigation dams and ditches | 184 | 329 | 405 |
| Irrigate meadows and pastures | 722 | 833 | 1,142 |
| Fertilize and spray meadows | 36 | 55 | 129 |
| Cut, rake, bale and stack hay | 797 | 1,296 | 2,112 |
| Labor on small grain production | 113 | 209 | 708 |
| Drag meadows and pastures | 66 | 91 | 142 |
| Fence haystacks | 125 | 197 | 744 |
| Sub total labor on crops | 2,043 | 3,010 | 5,382 |
| Livestock labor inputs |  |  |  |
| Feeding and chores | 792 | 947 | 1,732 |
| Calving labor | 338 | 382 | 712 |
| Moving cattle to summer pastures | 88 | 128 | 189 |
| Branding, dehorning, etc. | 48 | 98 | 164 |
| Care while on summer pasture | 202 | 235 | 527 |
| Roundup and return to ranch | 86 | 109 | 258 |
| Culling and shipping | 39 | 59 | 142 |
| Weaning calves | 28 | 43 | 56 |
| Veterinary work and spraying | 254 | 304 | 383 |
| General management and inspection | 775 | 1,168 | 1,697 |
| Other | 100 | 229 | 427 |
| Sub total on livestock | 2,750 | 3,702 | 6,287 |
| Miscellaneous and overhead |  |  |  |
| Repair haying machinery | 202 | 271 | 421 |
| Fence building and repairing | 432 | 450 | 786 |
| Land and resource development | 51 | 102 | 156 |
| Building repair and construction | 39 | 115 | 170 |
| General miscellaneous | 46 | 44 | 48 |
| Sub total miscellaneous | 770 | 982 | 1,581 |
| Total labor (crops, livestock, misc.) | 5,563 | 7,694 | 13,250 |
| Cu per ranch | 382 | 725 | 1,719 |
| Hours per cu | 14.6 | 10.6 | 7.7 |
| Months of labor per ranch | 22.2 | 30.8 | 53.0 |
| Man equivalent per ranch | 1.8 | 2.6 | 4.6 |
| Cu per man equivalent | 212 | 278 | 374 |
| Acres of hay per ranch | 330 | 583 | 1,425 |
| Tons of hay harrvested per ranch | 598 | 995 | 2,193 |
| Hours per ton of hay | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.1 |

Table 6. Labor requirements by months for small, medium and large ranches.
(60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

| Month | Average number of hours worked on: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Small ranches | Medium ranches | Large ranches |
| January | 202 | 344 | 612 |
| February | 202 | 344 | 612 |
| March | 374 | 479 | 757 |
| April | 488 | 723 | 1,182 |
| May | 576 | 783 | 1,277 |
| June | 651 | 940 | 1,377 |
| July | 792 | 1,084 | 1,732 |
| August | 900 | 1,093 | 1,984 |
| September | 491 | 649 | 1,469 |
| October | 371 | 477 | 882 |
| November | 254 | 412 | 749 |
| December | 262 | 366 | 617 |
| Total per ranch | 5,563 | 7,694 | 13,250 |
| Use of labor on: |  |  |  |
| Livestock | 2,750 | 3,702 | 6,287 |
| Crops | 2,043 | 3,010 | 5,382 |
| Overhead | 770 | 982 | 1,581 |
| Total per ranch | 5,563 | 7,694 | 13,250 |



The most common method of haying in Wyoming is to swath the hay and bale it with string or wire ties and pick up the bales with front end loaders or with bale wagons.


Figure 2. Distribution of ranch labor throughout the year 1972.


Most Wyoming hay is harvested with a swather which cuts and windrows. An attached conditioner flattens alfalfa and clover stems which permit faster drying.


This excellent outfit takes most of the labor out of feeding loose hay on a cold winter day.

## Earnings and Production Costs -- A Comparison by Size Groups

The preceding section discussed organizational characteristics of small, medium and large ranches in terms of land resources, livestock inventory numbers, components of investment and labor requirements. This section will discuss the components of expenses and income on a per ranch basis and on a per cu basis for small, medium and large ranches.

Cash operating costs consist of such items as hired labor, feed purchased, repairs, fuel, etc. Non-cash costs include an annual charge for depreciation on improvements, machinery and bulls. Cash and non-cash costs together constitute the total operating costs as defined herein. However, a more accurate measurement of total operating costs must include a wage for the operator, interest paid on debt and imputed interest on the owner's equity.

The operating expenses of the average small, medium and large ranches are shown in Table 7. The small ranches with an average of 382 cu had a total operating cost of $\$ 32,790$ compared to $\$ 59,250$ for the medium-size ranches and $\$ 158,020$ for the large ranches.

The average income per ranch from sales of livestock and from livestock inventory adjustment is shown in Table 8. The small ranches sold $119,887 \mathrm{lb}$. of beef at an average price of $\$ 50.91$ per cwt. or a total value of $\$ 61,040$. The increase in livestock inventory amounting to $6,972 \mathrm{lb}$. was valued at $\$ 2,570$, giving a total livestock sales and inventory increase of $\$ 63,610$. For mediumsize ranches the average selling price per cwt. was $\$ 47.26$ and the average income from sales and inventory increase was $\$ 111,090$. For the average large ranch the income from sales and inventory increase was $\$ 264,300$ (Table 8).

Table 7. Operating expenses per ranch for small, medium and large ranches. ( 60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

| Cost Component | Averages for |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \text { small } \\ & \text { ranches } \\ & (382 \mathrm{cu}) \end{aligned}$ | 20 medium ranches (725 cu) | $\begin{gathered} 20 \text { large } \\ \text { ranches } \\ (1,719 \mathrm{cu}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Cash costs |  |  |  |
| Hired labor | \$ 4,859 | \$ 9,998 | \$ 23,212 |
| Feed purchased | 3,820 | 5,896 | 44,303 |
| Grazing fees | 2,487 | 4,103 | 10,675 |
| Repairs and transportation | 2,055 | 3,525 | 6,962 |
| Utilities | 867 | 1,762 | 3,043 |
| Veterinary service and supplies | 1,17. | 2,784 | 5,071 |
| Insurance | 798 | 1,341 | 2,114 |
| Taxes | 2,594 | 4,843 | 10,383 |
| Crop expense | 2,445 | 3,466 | 7,701 |
| Fuel, oil and grease | 1,799 | 3,574 | 5,690 |
| Supplies | 1,448 | 2,632 | 6,498 |
| Interest at 4\% on cash costs | 986 | 1,791 | 5,105 |
| All other cash costs | 611 | 1,486 | 2,939 |
| Total cash costs | \$ 25,940 | \$ 47,201 | \$133,696 |
| Non-cash costs |  |  |  |
| Depreciation on improvements | \$ 1,444 | \$ 2,378 | \$ 3,988 |
| Depreciation on machinery | 3,847 | 6,735 | 13,202 |
| Depreciation on bulls | 1,559 | 2,936 | 7,134 |
| Total non-cash costs | \$ 6,850 | \$ 12,049 | \$ 24,324 |
| TOTAL OPERATING COSTS* | \$ 32,790 | \$ 59,250 | \$158,020 |

[^3]Table 8. Average income per ranch from livestock sales and inventory change. (Small, Medium and Large M.V. Ranches, 1973)


The income and earnings per ranch for the three size groups is presented in Table 9. Ranch income is computed by subtracting total operating costs from total income and represents the return for the operator's labor and management and for all ranch capital. For the average small ranch this was $\$ 30,820$. Subtracting an arbitrary imputed wage of $\$ 10,380$ from ranch income gives $\$ 20,440$ as the return to the average ranch capital of $\$ 455,700$ or $4.48 \% ~(\$ 20,440 / \$ 455,700=4.48 \%)$. The range in earnings for the 20 small ranches was $.85 \%$ to $8.45 \%$. The medium-size ranches earned $4.03 \%$ and the large ranches $4.37 \%$.

The per ranch data from the three preceding tables is next summarized and presented on a cu basis (Table 10). Earnings are influenced by costs as well as income. As computed in Table 10 costs include all expenses the rancher must meet in the production process except interest he has paid on real estate debt, an imputed wage for the operator's labor and management and an imputed interest charge for the ranch capital. For the three size groups and omitting these three items, the cost per cu was $\$ 85.84$ for the small ranches, $\$ 81.72$ for the medium-size group and $\$ 91.92$ for the large ranches.

Table 9. Income and earnings per ranch for small, medium and large ranches. ( 60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages for |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 small ranches | 20 medium ranches | 20 large ranches |
| Livestock sales | \$ 61,040 | \$101,900 | \$ 259,450 |
| Livestock inventory adjustment | 2,570 | 9,190 | 4,850 |
| Total income | 63,610 | 111,090 | 264,300 |
| T'otal operating costs* | 32,790 | 59,250 | 158,020 |
| Ranch income** | 30,820 | 51,840 | 106,280 |
| Imputed operator's wage*** | 10,380 | 12,760 | 20,370 |
| Return to capital | 20,440 | 39,080 | 85,910 |
| Total capital invested | \$455,700 | \$970,900 | \$1,965,400 |
| Percent return to capital | 4.48 | 4.03 | 4.37 |
| Range in percent return to capital | .85-8.45 | .67-7.36 | .81-7.88 |

*Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on owner's equity.
**Return for operator's labor and management and all rach, capital.
$* * *$ Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management fee.

Table 10. Income and earnings per cattle unit for small, medium and large ranches.
( 60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages for |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 20 small <br> ranches | 20 medium <br> ranches | 20 large <br> ranches |
| Livestock sales | $\$ 159.79$ | $\$ 140.54$ | $\$ 150.93$ |
| Livestock inventory adjustment | 6.73 | 12.68 | 2.82 |
| Total income | $\$ 166.52$ | $\$ 153.22$ | $\$ 153.75$ |
| Total operating costs* | 85.84 | 81.72 | 91.92 |
| Ranch income** | 80.68 | 71.50 | 61.83 |
| Imputed operator's wage*** | 27.17 | 17.60 | 11.85 |
| Return to capital | 53.51 | 53.90 | 49.98 |
| Total capital invested | $\$ 1,193.00$ | $\$ 1,339.00$ | $\$ 1,143.00$ |
| Percent return to capital | 4.48 | 4.03 | 4.37 |
| Range in percent return to capital | $.85-8.45$ | $.67-7.36$ | $.81-7.88$ |

[^4]The ranch income per cu was $\$ 80.68$ for the small ranches, $\$ 71.50$ for the medium-size group and $\$ 61.83$ for the large ranches (Table 10).

The cost of producing beef can be computed by adding to the operating costs per ranch the imputed wage for the operator and an imputed interest charge on the ranch capital at the rate of 3 or $6 \%$. Using $6 \%$ imputed interest, the total cost of producing beef was $\$ 70,410$ for the
small; $\$ 130,330$ for the medium; and $\$ 296,310$ for the large ranch (Table 11). On a cwt. basis, this is $\$ 55.50$ for the small, $\$ 54.93$ for the medium and $\$ 52.87$ for the large ranches. If $3 \%$ imputed interest is used instead of $6 \%$ on ranch capital, the production cost per cwt. is $\$ 44.79$ for the small, $\$ 42.64$ for the medium and $\$ 42.36$ for the large ranches.

Table 11. Cost of producing beef cattle on small, medium and large ranches.
( 60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

| Kind of production expenses | Small | Medium | Large |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Operating cost per ranch | $\$ 32,790$ | $\$ 59,250$ | $\$ 158,020$ |
| Wage imputed to operator for labor |  |  |  |
| and management | 10,380 | 12,760 | 20,370 |
| Interest on total ranch capital @ $6 \%$ | 27,240 | 58,320 | 117,920 |
| $\quad$ Total production cost per ranch | $\$ 70,410$ | $\$ 130,330$ | $\$ 296,310$ |
| $\quad$ Per cwt. of beef | $\$ 55.50$ | $\$ 54.93$ | $\$ 52.87$ |
| Pounds of beef produced | 126,859 | 237,261 | 560,364 |



[^5]
# Factors Infuencing Earnings on Mountain Valley Cattle Ranches - 1973 

This section examines several factors partly under the control of the operator which are believed to influence ranch earnings-size of ranch business, rate of production, efficiency of production, prices received for beef sold and management practices followed. Each of these measurements is examined in terms of income, costs,
earnings and other related criteria. Some ranchers were doing very well financially and others doing poorly while operating under similar conditions. To analyze this situation, the data for the 60 cattle ranches were arrayed from high to low based on the percentage return to total capital.

Table 12. Income, costs and earnings-based on percent return to capital.
( 60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages per cattle unit for |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Income, costs and earnings | $\mathbf{1 2}$ highest | $\mathbf{1 2}$ lowest | $\mathbf{6 0}$ ranches |
| Livestock sales | $\$ 174.08$ | $\$ 136.98$ | $\$ 149.47$ |
| Livestock inventory adjustment | 2.90 | 10.12 | 5.88 |
| Total income | 176.98 | 147.10 | 155.35 |
| Total operating costs* | 83.70 | 112.77 | 88.48 |
| Ranch income** | 93.28 | 34.33 | 66.87 |
| Imputed operator's wage**** | 18.28 | 15.02 | 15.39 |
| Return to capital | 75.00 | 19.31 | 51.48 |
| Total capital invested | 1,096 | 1,199 | 1,200 |
| Percent return to capital | 6.84 | 1.61 | 4.29 |

*Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on owner's equity.
**Return for operator's labor and management and all ranch capital.
***Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management fee.

## Percentage Return to Total Capital

The 12 ranches or the $20 \%$ with the highest percentage return are compared to the $20 \%$ of the ranches with the lowest percentage return (Table 12). The highest earning group had an average return to capital of $6.84 \%$ compared to $1.61 \%$ for the group showing the poorest earnings and $4.29 \%$ for the average of all 60 ranches.

What are the reasons that one group was doing so well financially and the other doing so poorly? The high return group had a $90 \%$ calf crop which resulted in 350 pounds of beef produced per cu and sales of $\$ 176.98$ per cu. The low return group had only an $84 \%$ calf crop with 314 pounds of beef per cu and sales of $\$ 147.10$ per cu.

For the high return group, the cost of producing $266,300 \mathrm{lb}$. of beef was $\$ 128,314$ or $\$ 48.18 /$ cwt., compared to $\$ 61.76$ for the low return group and $\$ 55.60$ for the average of 60 ranches (Table 13). This low cost of production for the group showing the very good return was a result of several factors: the ability to hold cash and noncash costs to a very low level, the high percentage calf crop and a low investment cost per cu.

This sort based on percent return to total capitol seems to indicate that success in the cattle business is a result of a rancher's ability in holding down cash costs and at the same time, receiving a high rate of production and high prices for beef sold.

Table 13. Statistical measurements-based on percent return to capital. (60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages per ranch for |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Measure of | 12 highest | 12 lowest | 60 ranches |
| Business size |  |  |  |
| Total cu | 765 | 936 | 942 |
| Total capital | $\$ 838,400$ | $\$ 1,122,200$ | $\$ 1,130,700$ |
| Total receipts | $\$ 135,390$ | $\$ 137,680$ | $\$ 146,340$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Rate of production |  |  |  |
| Pounds of beef produced per cu | 350 | 314 | 329 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency of production |  |  |  |
| Percent death loss—cattle | 4.4 | 4.3 |  |
| Percent death loss-calves | 1.7 | 1.9 | 1.7 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Prices received (per cwt.) |  |  |  |
| All livestock (av.) | $\$ 52.50$ | $\$ 46.30$ | $\$ 49.20$ |
| Percent of sales from calves | 39.6 | 32.7 | 31.4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Production cost calculations |  |  |  |
| Total cost (cash and non-cash) | $\$ 64,030$ | $\$ 105,550$ | $\$ 83,350$ |
| Imputed operator's wage | 13,980 | 14,060 | 14,500 |
| Imputed interest on capital ( $6 \%$ ) | 50,304 | 67,332 | 67,842 |
| Total production cost | 128,314 | 186,942 | 165,692 |
| Net beef produced (lb.) | 266,300 | 302,700 | 298,000 |
| Production cost per cwt. | $\$ 48.18$ | $\$ 61.76$ | $\$ 55.60$ |

## Size of Ranch Business

In this sort we will examine the influence of size of ranch business on the earnings of cattle ranches (Table 14). The 12 largest ranches with an average of $2,046 \mathrm{cu}$ per ranch earned $4.08 \%$ return on ranch capital. The 12 smallest ranches with an average of 329 cu per ranch, earned a $4.70 \%$ return on ranch capital.

The large group had 6.2 times more cu than the smallest group; however, it had only 5.5 times more capital invested and therefore the investment per cu for the large group was more effi-cient- $\$ 1,085$ per cu., compared to $\$ 1,224$ for the small size group (Table 14).

It is difficult to study the influence of size of business on ranch earnings in this particular grouping because factors other than size are not equal. However, we can point out a few facts. The small ranches had a higher rate of production-
the $91 \%$ calf crop at market time resulted in 344 lb . of beef per cu , compared to only 314 lb . for the large size outfits (Table 15). This high percent calf crop may be part of the reason for a higher rate of earnings for the small ranches. The large ranches requirel only 2.1 hr to produce a ton of hay and handled 452 cu per man. In contrast, the small outfits neded 3.9 hr per ton of hay and handled only 196 cu per man. The average price received by the small ranches was $\$ 52.20 / \mathrm{cwt}$. and about $46 \%$ of the income was from the sale of calves. In contrast, the average price received by the large outfits was $\$ 47.40$ / cwt. and only about $20 \%$ of the sales was from calves. The cost of production per cwt. of beef was similar for both groups.

This sort (Tables 14-15) indicates that a well-managed small ranch with 329 cu , and an investment of $\$ 402,800$ was able to make a satisfactory return on investment during 1973, a year of very high cattle prices.

Table 14. Income, costs and earnings-based on size of ranch business.
( 60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  |  | Averagse per cattle unit for |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income, costs and earnings | 12 | largest | 12 smallest |
| Livestock sales | $\$ 150.85$ | $\$ 168.57$ | $\$ 149.47$ |
| Livestock inventory adjustment | -2.61 | 6.44 | 5.88 |
| Total income | 148.24 | 175.01 | 155.35 |
| Total operating costs* | 93.03 | 86.84 | 88.48 |
| Ranch income** | 55.21 | 88.17 | 66.87 |
| Imputed operator's wage*** | 10.90 | 30.64 | 15.39 |
| Return to capital | 44.31 | 57.53 | 51.48 |
| Total capiatl invested | 1,085 | 1,224 | 1,200 |
| Percent return to capital | 4.08 | 4.70 | 4.29 |

*Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on owner's equity.
**Return for operator's labor and management and all ranch capital.
***Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management fee.

Table 15. Statistical measurements-based on size of ranch business. ( 60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages per ranch for |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Measure of | $\mathbf{1 2}$ largest | 12 smallest | $\mathbf{6 0}$ ranches |
| Business size |  |  |  |
| Total cu | 2,046 | 329 | 942 |
| Total capital | $\$ 2,219,700$ | $\$ 402,800$ | $\$ 1,130,700$ |
| Total receipts | 303,280 | 57,580 | 146,340 |
| Rate of production |  |  |  |
| Pounds of beef produced per cu |  |  |  |
| Efficiency of production | 314 | 344 | 329 |
| Percent death loss-cattle |  |  |  |
| Percent death loss-calves | 4.2 | 4.5 |  |
|  | 1.7 | 1.6 | 4.5 |
| Prices received (per cwt.) |  |  | 1.7 |
| All livestock (av.) |  |  |  |
| Percent of sales from calves | $\$ 47.40$ | $\$ 52.20$ | $\$ 49.20$ |
|  | 19.7 | 45.5 | 31.4 |
| Production cost calculations |  |  |  |
| Total cost (cash and non-cash) | $\$ 190,330$ | $\$ 28,570$ | $\$ 83,350$ |
| Imputed operator's wages | 22,300 | 10,080 | 14,500 |
| Imputed interest on capital (6\%) | 133,182 | 24,168 | 67,842 |
| Total production cost | 345,812 | 62,818 | 165,692 |
| Net beef produced (lb.) | 645,100 | 113,600 | 298,000 |
| $\quad$ Production cost per cwt. | $\$ 53.61$ | $\$ 55.29$ | $\$ 55.60$ |

## Pounds of Beef per Cattle Unit

Twelve ranches produced an average of 386 lb . of beef per cu compared to 276 lb . for the group with the lowest rate of production. This was $40 \%$ more beef per cu $(386 / 276=140)$. However, they earned only $3.95 \%$ return on capital, compared to $3.00 \%$ for the low producing group, and $4.29 \%$ for the average of 60 ranchers.

The high producers had attained this high rate of production at a high operating cost per cu$\$ 112.80$ compared to $\$ 87.49$ for the low producers and $\$ 88.48$ for the average (Table 16).

High rates of production in cattle ranching, while desirable and usually associated with higher rates of earnings, if attained at a high cost, do not pay as well as lower rates of production attained at more modest costs (Table 16 and 17).

Table 16. Income, costs and earnings-based on pounds of beef per cattle unit.
( 60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages per cattle unit for |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income, costs and earnings | $\mathbf{1 2}$ highest | 12 lowest | 60 ranches |
| Livestock sales | $\$ 175.47$ | $\$ 145.72$ | $\$ 149.47$ |
| Livestock inventory adjustment | -.59 | -10.73 | 5.88 |
| Total income | 174.88 | 134.99 | 155.35 |
| Total operating costs* | 112.80 | 87.49 | 88.48 |
| Ranch income** | 62.08 | 47.50 | 66.87 |
| Imputed operator's wages*** | 16.81 | 13.23 | 15.39 |
| Return to capital | 45.27 | 34.27 | 51.48 |
| Total capital invested | 1,147 | 1,143 | 1,200 |
| Percent return to capital | 3.95 | 3.00 | 4.29 |

[^6]Table 17. Statistical measurements-based on pounds of beef per cattle unit.
(60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages per ranch for |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Measure of | 12 highest | 12 lowest | 60 ranches |
| Business size |  |  |  |
| Total cu | 894 | 1,109 | 942 |
| Total capital | $\$ 1,025,800$ | $\$ 1,267,200$ | $\$ 1,130,700$ |
| Total receipts | $\$ 156,340$ | $\$ 149,700$ | $\$ 146,340$ |
| Rate of production |  |  |  |
| Pounds of beef produced per cu | 386 | 276 | 329 |
| Efficiency of production |  |  |  |
| Percent death loss-cattle | 4.4 | 5.7 | 4.5 |
| Percent death loss-calves | 1.2 | 2.3 | 1.7 |
| Prices received (per cwt.) |  |  |  |
| All livestock (av.) | $\$ 47.40$ | $\$ 50.60$ | $\$ 49.20$ |
| Percent of sales from calves | 17.3 | 43.1 | 31.4 |
| Production cost calculations |  |  |  |
| Total cost (cash and non-cash) | $\$ 100,840$ | $\$ 97,020$ | $\$ 83,350$ |
| Imputed operator's wage | 15,030 | 14,670 | 14,500 |
| Imputed interest on capital (6\%) | 61,548 | 76,032 | 67,842 |
| Total production cost | 177,418 | 187,722 | 165,692 |
| Net beef produced (lb.) | 342,700 | 305,200 | 298,000 |
| Production cost per cwt. | $\$ 51.77$ | $\$ 61.51$ | $\$ 55.60$ |

## Production Costs per Cwt. of Beef Produced

The 12 ranches with the lowest production cost per cwt. earned $6.41 \%$ return to total capital compared with $2.53 \%$ return for the group having the highest cost of production (Table 18).

The low-cost group had two advantagesmore income per cu and lower operating costs per cu resulting in a ranch income per cu of $\$ 88.98$ compared to $\$ 49.77$ for the high cost group.

The low cost group was about $25 \%$ larger than the high cost group as measured in terms of cu, yet the total capital investment per ranch was similar for the two groups (Table 19).

The high cost group received $56.3 \%$ of its income from the sale of calves and as a result, the average price per cwt. for livestock was $\$ 52.50$ compared to $\$ 48.50$ per cwt. for the low cost group which received only $15.3 \%$ of its income from the sale of calves.

In summary, the strong points of the low cost group include: excellent management as indicated in their cost control with a total cost per ranch of $\$ 70,600$ compared to $\$ 75,250$ for the ranch which had considerably fewer cu; and, the
total beef produced was considerably greater for the low cost group- $336,300 \mathrm{lb}$. as compared to $221,200 \mathrm{lb}$. for the high cost group. The result of holding costs to a minimum and yet obtaining a high rate of production resulted in a production cost per cwt. of $\$ 44.95$ for the low cost group compared to $\$ 67.66$ for the high cost group.

## Price Received per Cwt. of Beef Sold

Twelve ranches received an average selling price of $\$ 58.50$ per cwt. of beef, obtained $66 \%$ of its income from the sale of calves and earned $4.23 \%$ return on capital. In comparison, 12 other ranches received $\$ 41.00$ per cwt. for beef sold, got only $12 \%$ of its income from the sale of calves, and earned $3.04 \%$ return to capital (Tables 20 and 21).

The return earned on capntal was $39 \%$ higher for the group receiving the highest prices (4.23/ $3.04=139$ ).

The operating costs per cu were similar for both groups, but the group receiving the highest prices received about $\$ 20$ more income per cu. One point of strength in the group receiving low prices was its higher rate of production- 343 lb . of beef per cu. compared to 304 lb . for the group receiving high prices. This high rate of production partially offset the influence of low prices.

Table 18. Income, costs and earnings-based on production cost per cwt. beef.
( 60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  |  | Averages per cu for |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Income, costs and earnings | $\mathbf{1 2}$ lowest | $\mathbf{1 2}$ highest | 60 ranches |  |
| Livestock sales | $\$ 153.11$ | $\$ 150.96$ | $\$ 149.47$ |  |
| Livestock inventory adjustment | 9.72 | -4.72 | 5.88 |  |
| Total income | 162.83 | 146.24 | 155.35 |  |
| Total operating costs* | 73.85 | 96.47 | 88.48 |  |
| Ranch income** | 88.98 | 49.77 | 66.87 |  |
| Imputed operator's wage |  | 15.63 | 16.51 |  |
| Return to capital | 73.35 | 33.26 | 15.39 |  |
| Total capital invested | 1,144 | 1,315 | 51.48 |  |
| Percent return to capital | 6.41 | 2.53 | 1,200 |  |

[^7]Table 19. Statistical measurements-based on production cost per cwt. beef. (60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

| Measure of | Averages per ranch for |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12 lowest | 12 highest | 60 ranches |
| Business size |  |  |  |
| Total cu | 956 | 780 | 942 |
| Total capital | \$1,093,800 | \$1,025,400 | \$1,130,700 |
| Total receipts | \$ 155,660 | \$ 114,070 | \$ 146,340 |
| Rate of production |  |  |  |
| Pounds of beef produced per cu | 361 | 289 | 329 |
| Efficiency of production |  |  |  |
| Percent death loss-cattle | 4.3 | 5.2 | 4.5 |
| Percent death loss-calves | 1.3 | 2.2 | 1.7 |
| Prices received (per cwt.) |  |  |  |
| All livestock (av.) | \$48.50 | \$52.20 | \$49.20 |
| Percent of sales from calves | 15.3 | 56.3 | 31.4 |
| Production cost calculations |  |  |  |
| Total cost (cash and non-cash) | \$70,600 | \$75,250 | \$83,350 |
| Imputed operator's wage | 14,940 | 12,880 | 14,500 |
| Imputed interest on capital (6\%) | 65,628 | 61,524 | 67,842 |
| Total production cost | 151,168 | 149,654 | 165,692 |
| Net beef produced (lb.) | 336,300 | 221,200 | 298,000 |
| Production cost per cwt. | \$44.95 | \$67.66 | \$55.60 |

Table 20. Income, costs and earnings-based on price received per cwt. beef sold.
(60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages per cu for |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income, costs and earnings | $\mathbf{1 2}$ highest | 12 lowest | $\mathbf{6 0}$ ranches |
| Livestock sales | $\$ 160.54$ | $\$ 140.08$ | $\$ 149.47$ |
| Livestock inventory adjustment | 5.03 | 5.09 | 5.88 |
| Total income | 165.57 | 145.17 | 155.35 |
| Total operating costs* | 91.90 | 90.43 | 88.48 |
| Ranch income** | 73.67 | 54.74 | 66.87 |
| Imputed operator's wages*** | 18.70 | 14.52 | 15.39 |
| Return to capital | 54.97 | 40.22 | 51.48 |
| Total capital invested | 1,299 | 1,322 | 1,200 |
| Percent return to capital | 4.23 | 3.04 | 4.29 |

[^8]Table 21. Statistical measurements-based on price received per cwt. beef sold. (60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

| Measure of | Averages per ranch for |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12 highest | 12 lowest | 60 ranches |
| Businses size |  |  |  |
| Total cu | 691 | 987 | 942 |
| Total capital | \$897,900 | \$1,304,600 | \$1,130,700 |
| Total receipts | \$114,410 | \$ 143,280 | \$ 146,340 |
| Rate of production |  |  |  |
| Pounds of beef produced per cu | 304 | 343 | 329 |
| Efficiency of production |  |  |  |
| Percent death loss-cattle | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.5 |
| Percent death loss-calves | 1.9 | 1.4 | 1.7 |
| Prices received (per cwt.) |  |  |  |
| All livestock (av.) | \$58.50 | \$41.00 | \$49.20 |
| Percent of sales from calves | 66.1 | 11.7 | 31.4 |
| Production cost calculations |  |  |  |
| Total cost (cash and non-cash) | \$63,500 | \$89,250 | \$83,350 |
| Imputed operator's wage | 12,920 | 14,330 | 14,500 |
| Imputed interest on capital ( $6 \%$ ) | 53,874 | 78,276 | 67,842 |
| Total production cost | 130,294 | 181,856 | 165,692 |
| Net beef produced (lb.) | 205,200 | 334,900 | 298,000 |
| Productions cost per cwt. | \$63.50 | \$54.30 | \$55.60 |

## Percentage of Sales from Calves

In this sort 12 ranches which sold no calves are compared with 12 ranch which received $81.8 \%$ of their income from the sale of calves (Tables 22 and 23). The percent earned on capital was similar for both groups. The ranch income was similar for both groups as was the imputed operator's wage and the return to capital (Table 22). The group selling mainly calves was slightly larger682 cu compared to 611 for the group selling cowyearlings. The rate of production was similar for both groups and the death loss was also similar.

The production cost per cwt. of beef was $\$ 61.96$ for the cow-calf group and $\$ 52.14$ for the cowyearling group. The cow-calf group received a higher price per cwt. for beef sold than did the cow-yearling groups.

This sort seems to indicate that there is no definite advantage in running cow-calves over cow-yearlings or in running cow-yearlings rather than cow-calves. Rather, the level of management is more important than the class of livestock. With good management one can succeed in the cattle business in a year such as 1973 whether running cow-yearlings or cow-calves.

Table 22. Income, costs and earnings-based on percent of sales from calves. (60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages per cattle unit for |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Income, costs and earnings | $\mathbf{1 2}$ cow-calf | $\mathbf{1 2}$ cow-yearling | 60 ranches |
| Livestock sales | $\$ 175.81$ | $\$ 125.48$ | $\$ 149.47$ |
| Livestock inventory adjustment | -9.15 | 19.43 | 5.88 |
| Total income | 166.66 | 144.91 | 155.35 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total operating costs* | 94.62 | 72.26 | 88.48 |
| Ranch income** | 72.04 | 72.65 | 66.87 |
| Imputed operator's wage*** | 18.89 | 19.05 | 15.39 |
| Return to capital | 53.15 | 53.60 | 51.48 |
| Total capital invested | 1,203 | 1,261 | 1,200 |
| Percent return to capital | 4.42 | 4.25 | 4.20 |

[^9]Table 23. Statistical measurements-based on percent of sales from calves. (60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages per ranch for |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Measure of | $\mathbf{1 2}$ cow-calf | $\mathbf{1 2}$ cow-yearling | $\mathbf{6 0}$ ranches |
| Business size |  |  |  |
| Total cu | 682 | 611 | 942 |
| Total capital | $\$ 820,600$ | $\$ 770,700$ | $\$ 1,130,700$ |
| Total receipts | $\$ 113,660$ | $\$ 88,540$ | $\$ 146,340$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Rate of production |  |  |  |
| Pounds of beef produced per cu | 308 | 325 | 329 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency of production |  |  |  |
| Percent death loss-cattle | 4.8 | 5.1 |  |
| Percent death loss-calves | 2.0 | 1.6 | 4.5 |
|  |  |  | 1.7 |
| Prices received (per cwt.) | $\$ 55.80$ | $\$ 45.30$ |  |
| All livestock (av.) | 81.8 | 0 | $\$ 49.20$ |
| Percent of sales from calves |  |  | 31.4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Production cost calculations | $\$ 64,530$ | $\$ 44,150$ | $\$ 83,350$ |
| Total cost (cash and non-cash) | 12,880 | 11,640 | 14,500 |
| Imputed operator's wage | 49,236 | 46,242 | 67,842 |
| Imputed interest on capital (6\%) | 126,646 | 102,032 | 165,692 |
| Total production cost | 204,400 | 195,700 | 298,000 |
| Net beef produced (lb.) | $\$ 61.96$ | $\$ 52.14$ | $\$ 55.60$ |
| Production cost per cwt. |  |  |  |

# Measurements Describing Mountain Valley Cattle Ranching by Areas 

For each of the five areas, schedules were taken for four large ranches, four medium sized ranches and four small ranches. In this section we will present measurements which describe cattle ranch organization and operation for each of the five mountain valley areas. Measurements will be in terms of land investment, total capital requirements, income, expenses and earnings on a per ranch and on a per cu basis. Also cost of producing beef will be computed.

The average ranch size varied by areas. For example, the average rancher in the Green River area owned 4,640 acres of deeded land and had access to 2,122 AUM's on public land (Table 24). In the Platte-Snake area, the average rancher
owned 8,790 acres and had access to 2,883 AUM's on public land.

The ranch size, as measured by cu, varied from 853 in the Big Horn Basin to 1,053 in the Platte-Snake. Only $10 \%$ of the livestock sales were from calves in the Green River area and the average price per cwt. was $\$ 45.64$. In comparison, $53 \%$ of the sales were from calves in the Big Horn Basin and the average price per cwt. was $\$ 51.59$ (Table 24).

The ranches in the Bear River, Big Horn Basin and Green River areas were all about the same size as measured by total ranch investment, all averaging just slightly over $\$ 1$ million (Table 25).

Table 24. Statistical measurements for different areas.
(60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

| Measure of | Averages per ranch for |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bear River | Big Horn Basin | Green River | PlatteSnake | SheridanBuffalo |
| Business size |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total cu | 871 | 853 | 926 | 1,053 | 1,007 |
| Acres of deeded land | 6,190 | 6,480 | 4,640 | 8,790 | 7,610 |
| Man equivalent | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.5 |
| AUM's on public land | 2,432 | 2,843 | 2,122 | 2,883 | 2,445 |
| Rate of production |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent calf crop at market time | 86 | 90 | 88 | 76 | 88 |
| Efficiency of production |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent death loss-cattle | 4.4 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 4.4 |
| Percent death loss-calves | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.4 |
| Prices received (per cwt.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| All livestock (av.) | \$48.76 | \$51.59 | \$45.64 | \$46.94 | \$46.77 |
| Percent sales from calves | 25 | 53 | 10 | 24 | 16 |

The investment per cu was about $\$ 1,200$ for each of the five areas (Table 25). The ranches in the Platte-Snake area and in the Sheridan-Buffalo area were larger, having over $1,000 \mathrm{cu}$ and having an investment of about $\$ 1,300,000$ and $\$ 1,200,000$, respectively. The Bear River ranches had an average real estate debt of about $\$ 79,000$ per ranch, representing about $7.5 \%$ of the total ranch value. In comparison, the Green River ranchers had an
average debt of about $\$ 159,700$, representing $15.1 \%$ of the total ranch value.

The average income from the cattle sales and livestock inventory adjustment is shown in Table 26. This table gives detail by areas on the number, average weight and average price per cwt. of the different classes of livestock sold. The lightest calves were in the Platte-Snake and Bear River areas and averaged about 378 lb . in each

Table 25. Components of capital investment for different ranching areas. (60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

|  | Averages for |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bear River | Big Horn Basin | Green River | PlatteSnake | SheridanBuffalo |
| Deeded land and grazing |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buildings and improvements | 26,800 | 28,600 | 30,000 | 30,500 | 27,800 |
| Power \& machinery | 31,800 | 28,100 | 40,100 | 35,100 | 37,800 |
| Livestock | 242,200 | 236,000 | 261,700 | 294,700 | 281,700 |
| Feeds | 27,400 | 30,300 | 39,200 | 45,600 | 33,200 |
| Total | \$1,052,700 | \$1,054,500 | \$1,056,900 | \$1,298,100 | \$1,191,200 |
| Real estate debts | 79,300 | 88,900 | 159,700 | 176,900 | 150,500 |
| Owner's equity | \$973,400 | \$965,600 | \$897,200 | \$1,121,200 | \$1,040,700 |
| Percent of debt | 7.5 | 8.4 | 15.1 | 13.6 | 12.6 |
| Average per cu |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total investment | \$1,209 | \$1,236 | \$1,141 | \$1,233 | \$1,183 |
| Total debts | 91 | 104 | 172 | 168 | 149 |
| Owner's equity | \$1,118 | \$1,132 | \$969 | \$1,065 | \$1,034 |

*Includes AUM's on forest permits, BLM rights and state land rights at $\$ 25.00$ per AUM.
area. The calvse averaged 424 lb . in the Big Horn Basin and 421 lb . in the Sheridan-Buffalo area.

There was considerable variation in the average earnings in the five different areas. For example, the Platte-Snake area, with a total investment of $\$ 1,298,100$, had a return to capital of $\$ 40,630$ or a return on investment of $3.13 \%$ (Table 27). In the Big Horn Basin, the total capital investment was $\$ 1,054,500$ with a return to capital of $\$ 57,942$ or an average of $5.49 \%$.

The income, costs and earnings on a per cu basis is shown in Table 28. The cost per cwt. of beef produced was lowest in the Bear River area
and highest in the Platte-Snake area (Table 27). To compute the cost of producing beef, one must add to the operating costs per ranch an imputed wage for the labor and management of the operator and imputed interest on the ranch capital. For example, for the Bear River area the operating cost per ranch was $\$ 64,780$. Adding the imputed wage and imputed interest on capital, gives a total production cost per ranch of $\$ 141,738$. The average Bear River ranch produced $277,800 \mathrm{lb}$. of beef. This is a weighted average cost per cwt. of $\$ 51.02$. In a similar manner, cost of producing beef in the Platte-Snake area was $\$ 58.28$ per cwt. (Table 28).

Table 26. Average income per ranch for five mountain valley ranch areas.


Table 27. Income, cost of production and earnings per ranch for different areas. (60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranchse, 1973)

| Item | Bear <br> River | Big <br> Horn <br> Basin | Green River | PlatteSnake | SheridanBuffalo |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Livestock sales | \$ 120,943 | \$ 140,063 | \$ 145,819 | \$ 151,421 | \$ 145,735 |
| Livestock inventory adjust. | 11,408 | 2,829 | 5,496 | -2,231 | 10,200 |
| Total income | 132,351 | 142,892 | 151,315 | 149,190 | 155,935 |
| Total operating costs* | 64,780 | 70,610 | 93,830 | 93,930 | 93,610 |
| Ranch income** | 67,571 | 72,282 | 57,485 | 55,260 | 62,325 |
| Imputed operator's wage ${ }^{* * * *}$ | 13,780 | 14,340 | 14,760 | 14,630 | 15,000 |
| Return to capital | 53,791 | 57,942 | 42,725 | 40,630 | 47,325 |
| Total capital invested | \$1,052,700 | \$1,054,500 | \$1,056,900 | \$1,298,100 | \$1,191,200 |
| Percent return to capital | 5.11 | 5.49 | 4.04 | 3.13 | 3.97 |
| Imputed interest on capital at $6 \%$ | \$ 63,162 | \$ 63,270 | \$ 63,414 | \$ 77,886 | \$ 71,472 |
| Cost of production Per ranch | \$ 141,738 | \$ 148,220 | \$ 172,004 | \$ 186,446 | \$ 180,087 |
| Per cwt. of beef | \$51.02 | \$53.51 | \$52.08 | \$58.28 | \$53.79 |
| Pounds of beef produced | 277,800 | 277,000 | 330,300 | 319,900 | 334,800 |

[^10]Table 28. Income, costs and earnings per cattle unit for different areas.
(60 Wyo. M.V. Cattle Ranches, 1973)

| Income, costs and earnings | Averages per cu for |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bear River |  | Big Horn Basin |  | Green River |  | PlatteSnake |  | SheridanBuffalo |  |
| Livestock sales | \$ | 138.85 | \$ | 164.19 | \$ | 157.47 | \$ | 143.80 | \$ | 144.75 |
| Livestock inventory adjust. |  | 13.10 |  | 3.31 |  | 5.93 |  | -2.12 |  | 10.13 |
| Total income |  | 151.95 |  | 167.50 |  | 163.40 |  | 141.68 |  | 154.88 |
| Total operating costs* |  | 74.37 |  | 82.78 |  | 101.33 |  | 89.20 |  | 92.96 |
| Ranch income** |  | 77.58 |  | 84.72 |  | 62.07 |  | 52.48 |  | 61.92 |
| Imputed operator's wage*** |  | 15.82 |  | 16.81 |  | 15.94 |  | 13.89 |  | 14.90 |
| Return to capital |  | 61.76 |  | 67.91 |  | 46.13 |  | 38.59 |  | 47.02 |
| Total capital invested |  | 1,209 |  | 1,236 |  | 1,141 |  | 1,233 |  | 1,183 |
| Percent return to capital |  | 5.11 |  | 5.49 |  | 4.04 |  | 3.13 |  | 3.97 |

[^11]
## Case Study Analysis of Four Cattle Ranches

The purpose of this section is to present statistical maesurements which describe the organization and operation of two large cattle ranches and two small cattle ranches in Wyoming. One large ranch is well managed and is highly successful financially while the other, about $10 \%$ larger, is not so well managed and is less successful financially. A parallel but more pronounced situation exists in the analysis of two small ranches. One ranch is highly successful, due mainly to its high level of management. The other is unsuccessful financially due mainly to management.

## Economic Analysis of

Two Large Ranches
The number, weight and average price per cwt. of livestock sold and the inventory change is shown for the two large ranches (Table 29). The most successful ranch had ranch sales and inventory increase of $\$ 196,870$. This was for the production and sale of $408,350 \mathrm{lb}$. of beef. The average price per cwt. of the beef sold was $\$ 50.75$
and much of the beef sold were steer calves. The less successful ranch had about the same income but its main sales were from yearling steers and cows with few sales from calves. It had a lower price per cwt.

Perhaps the greatest point of strength in the management of the successful ranch was the rancher's ability to hold operating costs to a low level- $\$ 77,297$ per ranch or $\$ 67.04$ per cu. In comparison the less successful ranch had operating costs of $\$ 115,785$ or $\$ 90.67$ per cu (Table 30 ).

The earnings per ranch and per cu and the cost of producing beef for the two large ranches is shown in Table 31. The successful ranch had a ranch income of $\$ 119,573$ or $\$ 103.71$ per cu. The return to capital was $\$ 102,529$ or $7.88 \%$ on an investment of $\$ 1,301,275$. In comparison, the less successful ranch had a return to capital of $\$ 62,104$ for a capital investment of $\$ 1,805,804$ or a return of $3.44 \%$.

The cost of producing beef is determined by adding to the total ranch operating costs an imputed wage for the operator and imputed interest at $6 \%$ on the ranch capital. The cost of producing beef was $\$ 42.22$ per cwt. for the successful

Table 29. Components of ranch receipts-two large ranches.

| Class of cattle | Number sold | Average weight | Total weight | Average price | Total value of sale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (No.) | (lb.) | (lb.) | (\$/cwt.) | (dollars) |
| One successful ranch |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cows | 90 | 1,009 | 90,840 | \$34.68 | \$ 31,500 |
| Heifers 1's | 115 | 800 | 92,000 | 38.25 | 35,190 |
| Heifer calves | 87 | 348 | 30,310 | 56.68 | 17,180 |
| Steer calves | 363 | 400 | 145,200 | 67.49 | 98,000 |
| Total sales | 655 | xx | 358,350 | \$50.75 | \$181,870 |
| Livestcok inventory adjustment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Increase |  | xx | 50,000 | xx | 15,000 |
| Total production and income |  | xx | 408,350 | xx | \$196,870 |
| One less successful ranch |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cows | 174 | 1,125 | 195,820 | \$32.00 | \$ 62,664 |
| Heifers 1's | 110 | 668 | 73,470 | 50.08 | 36,798 |
| Heifer calves | 26 | 276 | 7,181 | 55.01 | 3,950 |
| Steers 1's | 240 | 752 | 180,600 | 49.00 | 88,494 |
| Total sales | 550 | xx | 457,071 | \$41.99 | \$191,906 |
| Livestock inventory adjustment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Increase |  | xx | 700 | xx | 2,925 |
| Total production and income |  | xx | 457,771 | xx | \$194,831 |

ranch and $\$ 52.67$ per cwt. for the less successful ranch (Table 31).

To summarize: the strong point in the management of the successful ranch was its ability to hold operating costs to a bare minimum, receive an excellent price from the sale of highpriced calves and at the same time receive a good calf crop of $91 \%$.

## Economic Anaylsis of <br> Two Small Ranches

The source of the ranch receipts is shown for both small ranches (Table 32). The amount of sales was very similar-about $\$ 63,000$ for each ranch. The successful ranch sold 40 yearling heifers at $\$ 53.62$ per cwt. and 80 yearling steers at $\$ 57.90$ per cwt. The less succesful ranch sold 120 steer calves weighing 440 lb . each at 66.56 per cwt. This was an excellent sale price and if the cost for production were held in line, this rancher should be making a good return on his investment.

The greatest point of strength for the successful small ranch was the ability of the manager to hold operating costs to a bare minimum. For example, the costs per cu were $\$ 67.55$ for the successful ranch, compared to $\$ 121.31$ for the less successful ranch (Table 33). The successful ranch had lower costs per cu in every cost category. It is not uncommon for the field enumerator to see some ranches who are somewhat wasteful-who spend too much money for hired labor, transportation costs and such items. The trite expression "whenever you get a dollar, hang on to it," seemed to work well for certain efficient ranchers encountered in this economic survey.

The income per cu did not differ greatly for the two ranches, but the successful ranch was able to control costs and held them down to the lowest possible level (Table 34). This resulted in a ranch income per cu of $\$ 121.03$ for the successful ranch and $\$ 52.59$ for the less successful ranch. The return to capital was $7.15 \%$ for the successful ranch and $1.60 \%$ for the unsuccessful ranch.

Table 30. Operating expenses per ranch and per cattle unit for two large ranches.
(One successful financially - the other less successful)

| Cost component | Averages for |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Successful ranch |  | Less successful ranch |  |
|  | Per ranch | Per cu | Per ranch | Per cu |
| Cash costs |  |  |  |  |
| Hired labor | \$16,412 | \$14.23 | \$21,879 | \$17.13 |
| Feed purchased | 10,288 | 8.92 | 18,402 | 14.41 |
| Grazing fees | 1,712 | 1.48 | 950 | . 74 |
| Repairs \& transportation | 6,394 | 5.55 | 6,874 | 5.38 |
| Utilities | 1,512 | 1.31 | 2,437 | 1.91 |
| Veterinary service \& supplies | 4,413 | 3.83 | 2,096 | 1.64 |
| Insurance | 332 | . 29 | 2,689 | 2.11 |
| Taxes | 7,595 | 6.59 | 9,934 | 7.78 |
| Crop expense | 2,302 | 2.00 | 10,102 | 7.91 |
| Fuel, oil and grease | 3,264 | 2.83 | 6,751 | 5.29 |
| Supplies | 1,343 | 1.16 | 10,659 | 8.35 |
| Interest at $4 \%$ on cash costs | 2,262 | 1.96 | 3,755 | 2.94 |
| All other cash costs | 988 | . 86 | 1,112 | . 87 |
| Total cash costs | $(\$ 58,817)$ | (\$51.01) | $(\$ 97,640)$ | (\$76.46) |
| Non-cash costs |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation on improvements | \$ 4,000 | \$ 3.47 | \$ 2,859 | \$ 2.24 |
| Depreciation on machinery | 10,000 | 8.67 | 9,786 | 7.66 |
| Depreciation on bulls | $4,480$ | $3.89$ | $5,500$ | $4.31$ |
| Total non-cash costs | $(\$ 18,480)$ | (\$16.03) | $(\$ 18,145)$ | (\$14.21) |
| Total operating costs* | \$77,297 | \$67.04 | \$115,785 | \$90.67 |

[^12]Table 31. Earnings per ranch and per cattle unit for two large ranches.
(One successful financially - the other less successful)

|  | Successful ranch |  | Less successful ranch |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per ranch | Per cu | Per ranch | Per cu |
| Livestock sales | \$ 181,870 | \$157.74 | \$ 191,906 | \$150.28 |
| Livestock inventory adjustment | 15,000 | 13.01 | 2,925 | 2.29 |
| Total income | 196,870 | 170.75 | 194,831 | 152.57 |
| Total operating costs* | 77,297 | 67.04 | 115,785 | 90.67 |
| Ranch income** | 119,573 | 103.71 | 79,046 | 61.90 |
| Imputed operators wage*** | 17,044 | 14.78 | 16,942 | 13.28 |
| Return to capital | 102,529 | 88.92 | 62,104 | 48.63 |
| Total capital invested | \$1,301,275 | \$1,129 | \$1,805,804 | \$1,414 |
| Percent returned to capital | 7.88 |  | 3.44 |  |
| Imputed interest @ 6\% on ranch capital | \$ 78,077 | \$ 67.72 | \$ 108,348 | \$ 84.85 |
| Costs of producing beef Per ranch | \$ 172,418 | \$149.54 | \$ 241,075 | \$188.78 |
| Per cwt. | \$42.22 |  | \$52.67 |  |
| Carrying cost per cu | \$150 |  | \$189 |  |

[^13]Table 32. Components of ranch receipts-two small ranches.

| Class of cattle | Number sold | Average weight | Total weight | Average price | Total value of sale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (No.) | (lb.) | (lb.) | (\$/cwt.) | (dollars) |
| One successful ranch |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cows | 24 | 1,020 | 24,480 | \$30.62 | \$ 7,496 |
| Heifers-yearlings | 40 | 718 | 28,720 | 53.62 | 15,400 |
| Steers-yearlings | 80 | 779 | 62,310 | 57.90 | 36,080 |
| Total sales | 144 |  | 115,510 | 51.06 | 58,976 |
| Livestock inventory adjustment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Increase |  |  | 14,000 | xxx | 4,200 |
| Total production and income | xxx | Xxx | 129,510 | Xxx | 63,176 |
| One less successful ranch |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cows | 57 | 1,063 | 60,600 | 32.02 | 19,402 |
| Steers-calves | 120 | 440 | 52,810 | 66.56 | 35,149 |
| Total sales | 177 |  | 113,410 | 48.10 | 54,551 |
| Livestock inventory adjustment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Increase |  |  | 13,320 | xxx | 8,750 |
| Total production and income | xxx | xxx | 126,730 | Xxx | 63,301 |

Table 33. Operating expenses per ranch and per cattle unit tor two small ranches.
(One successful financially, the other less successful)

| Cost component | Averages for |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Successful ranch |  | Less successful ranch |  |
|  | Per ranch | Per cu | Per ranch | Per cu |
| Cash costs |  |  |  |  |
| Hired labor | \$ 4,340 | \$12.96 | \$ 6,950 | \$ 19.09 |
| Feed purchased | 600 | 1.79 | 4,934 | 13.55 |
| Grazing fees | 1,450 | 4.33 | 1,736 | 4.77 |
| Repairs \& transportation | 1,280 | 3.82 | 4,543 | 12.48 |
| Utilities | 675 | 2.01 | 914 | 2.51 |
| Veterinary service \& supplies | 600 | 1.79 | 1,185 | 3.26 |
| Insurance | 469 | 1.40 | 867 | 2.38 |
| Taxes | 2,750 | 8.21 | 3,940 | 10.82 |
| Crop expense | 1,680 | 5.01 | 5,536 | 15.21 |
| Fuel, oil and grease | 920 | 2.75 | 1,966 | 5.41 |
| Supplies | 272 | . 81 | 1,497 | 4.11 |
| Interest at $4 \%$ on cash costs | 625 | 1.87 | 1,363 | 3.74 |
| All other cash costs | 580 | 1.73 | 1,816 | 4.99 |
| Total cash costs | $(\$ 16,241)$ | (\$48.48) | $(\$ 37,247)$ | (\$102.32) |
| Non-cash costs |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation on improvements | \$ 2,674 | \$ 7.98 | \$ 1,287 | \$ 3.54 |
| Depreciation on machinery | 2,817 | 8.42 | 3,720 | 10.22 |
| Depreciation on bulls | 896 | 2.67 | 1,904 | 5.23 |
| Total non-cash costs | $(\$ 6,387)$ | (\$19.07) | (\$ 6,911) | (\$ 18.99) |
| Total operating costs* | \$22,628 | \$67.55 | \$44,158 | \$121.31 |

*Except interest paid on debt, wage for operator and imputed interest on owner's capital.


A mobile chute for branding, earmarking. or giving medications is a necessary tool for even the smallest ranch.

Table 34. Earnings per ranch and per cattle unit for two small ranches.
(One successful financially, the other less successful)

| Income, costs and earnings | Successful ranch |  | Less successful ranch |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per ranch | Per cu | Per ranch | Per cu |
| Livestock sales | \$ 58,976 | \$176.04 | \$ 54,551 | \$149.86 |
| Livestock inventory adjustment | 4,200 | 12.54 | 8,750 | 24.04 |
| Total income | 63,176 | 188.58 | 63,301 | 173.90 |
| Total operating costs* | 22,628 | 67.55 | 44,158 | 121.31 |
| Ranch income** | 40,548 | 121.03 | 19,143 | 52.59 |
| Imputed operator's wage*** | 10,359 | 30.92 | 10,365 | 28.48 |
| Return to capital | 30,189 | 90.11 | 8,778 | 24.11 |
| Total capital invested | \$422,064 | \$ 1,260 | \$548,824 | \$ 1,508 |
| Percent return to capital | 7.15 |  | 1.60 |  |
| Imputed interest @ 6\% on ranch capital | \$ 25,324 | \$ 75.59 | \$ 32,929 | \$ 90.46 |
| Cost of producing beef Per ranch | \$ 58,311 | \$174.06 | \$ 87,452 | \$240.25 |
| Per cwt. | \$ 45.02 |  | \$ 69.01 |  |
| Carrying cost per cu | \$174 |  | , \$240 |  |

*Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on owner's equity.
**Return for operator's labor and management and all ranch capital.
*** Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management fee.


One hundred half-brothers and half-sisters. The best of these AI heifers will go into the replacement herd. The rest, along with the steers, will go into someone's feedlot. Established producers of AI calves frequently get a small premium per pound for fceder calves. Producers who do not get the premium should consider feeding out or warming up their own calves.

## Livestock Management Practices

Both good and poor management practices are reflected in ranch earnings. Good range management, adequate water facilities which are strategically located, careful attention to the health of the herd, progressive breeding practices, upgrading of the beef herd, efficient and timely hay production methods, wise and intelligent supervision of labor and a watchful eye to control annual operating expenses are some of the management practices under the control of the operator. These and perhaps other practices determine success or failure of a cattle ranch business.

The managerial strategies and skills observed among the 60 ranchers, in the opinion of the writer, ranged from excellent to average. Likewise there was a wide range in the types and kinds of management practices followed. These facts will be borne out in the following discussion.

## Cow Herd Management

About $14-18 \%$ of the cow herd is replaced each year. With an $86 \%$ calf crop, 18 of the 43 heifer calves available from each 100 cows must be kept as replacements for the cows which are culled, or which have died. Ranchers frequently keep from 18-22 of the top heifers, carry them until the next spring or fall and then cull down to $14-18$ head, depending on whether they are trying to maintain, increase or decrease the size of the breeding herd. Culling replacement heifers in the spring and again in the fall helps upgrade the herd.

In the fall, the more progressive ranchers run the breeding herd through the chute to pregnancy test first calf heifers and the cows which seem questionable. A check is made of udder, teeth, eyes and feet and general physical conditions. Culling open cows and those which are otherwise defective can do much to increase the amount of beef produced and the amount of ranch earnings.

Feeding the breeding herd usually begins sometime in December or in early January and continces until May. It requires from 1-2 tons of hay per head, depending on the duration of winter, amount of aftermath pasture, protein supplement used and whether or not winter grazing is available.

The most common breeding season is from

June 1 to September 1, although some ranchers who winter their cattle especially well and whose cows are in a high state of nutrition, begin breeding a month earlier. Ranchers who breed late in the season have little problems with cows being in poor physical condition. Excessively thin cows, or cows and bulls which are excessively fat are usually poor breeders.

The usual custom is to supply 4 or 5 bulls per 100 cows although some outfits who have no opportunity to pasture breed even a part of the cows, use as many as 6 bulls per 100 cows, particularly where first calf heifers are run separately. In this study, nearly one-half of the operators raise all or part of their bulls from small registered herds. These men buy new bulls periodically and pay from $\$ 500-\$ 1,200$ for such sires. Those who purchase range bulls pay from $\$ 400$ $\$ 600$ each and use them for four years although the range in use is from 3-7 years. About onethird of the ranchers feed from 1-2 lb. of protein supplement daily to their bulls for a period of 6 weeks before breeding season. This is in addition to hay fed free choice. One-half of the ranchers have their bulls fertility tested. Five outfits use artificial insemination on part of their cows. One ranch engages in production testing on part of the herd.

## Management of Replacement Heifers

Nearly all the ranchers breed replacement heifers at about 15 months of age so they will calve at about 24 months. Some complain, however, if they calve as two's, part of them, due to poor physical condition, will not calve as three's. The more successful ranchers select replacement heifers from their top quality cows which are bred to top performing bulls. They breed only the yearling heifers which weigh around 600 lb . or more. The ranchers feed such heifers heavily during pregnancy and watch them carefully during calving. They provide sufficient feed so the heifer can supply adequate milk to raise a healthy, vigorous calf, and be able to breed again and calve as a three-year-old. Some ranchers, to give a heifer a break, wean these calves one month ahead of the calves from the regular herd and give them special care, feeding protein, minerals and vitamins in addition to hay. Some operators find it pays to run two-year-old heifers as well as three-year-old heifers separately from the reg-


Photographs taken by Jack Richard Studio, Cody,Wyoming, appear on pages $1,5,9$, 37,39 , and 44.
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[^0]:    Source: Wyoming Agricultural Statistics, compiled by Wyoming Crop and Livestock Reporting Service, November, 1973.

[^1]:    *M.V. is an abbreviation for Mountain Valley.

[^2]:    *Includes forest permits, BLM rights and state land rights.

[^3]:    *Except interest paid on debt, wage for operator and imputed interest on owner's capital.

[^4]:    *Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on owner's equity.
    **Return for operator's labor and management and all rach capital.
    ***Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management fee.

[^5]:    Where AI programs are in use cattle are freauenlty branded with water soluble black paint which permits the operator to observe the cow 21 days later to see if she has "settled".

[^6]:    *Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on owner's equity.
    **Return for operator's labor and management and all ranch capital.
    ***Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management fee.

[^7]:    *Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on owner's equity.
    **Return for operator's labor and management and all ranch capital.
    *** Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management fee.

[^8]:    *Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on owner's equity.
    **Return for operator's labor and management and all ranch capital.
    *** Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management fee.

[^9]:    *Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on owner's equity.
    **Return for operator's labor and management and all ranch capital.
    *** Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management fee.

[^10]:    *Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on ownex's equity.
    ***eturn for operator's labor and management and all ranch capital.
    ***Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management fee.

[^11]:    *Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on owner's equity.
    **Return for operator's labor and management and all ranch capital.
    ** Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management fee.

[^12]:    *Except interest paid on debt, wage for operator and imputed interest on owner's capital.

[^13]:    *Except interest paid on debt, operator's wage and interest on owner's equity.
    **Return for operator's labor and management and all ranch capital.
    ***Wage for labor $\$ 7,200$ plus $5 \%$ of total income for management.

