

## Case Study - MB-2 vs. US-210-0

## Farm Descriptions

MB-2 is a cow-calf and pre-conditioning operation in Manitoba, Canada, located in the Interlake Plain ecoregion. This farm has 225 head of beef cows, and keeps purebred as well as commercial animals. The cow-calf enterprise is situated on 1,394 ac with chernozemic, brunisolic, and luvisolic soils. The climate is semi-arid. Mean annual temperature is $2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and mean annual precipitation is $500-525 \mathrm{~mm}$, with May-September the period of highest precipitation.

US-210-0 is a cow-calf and backgrounding operation in Nex Mexico, USA. This farm has a beef cow herd of 220 head, and keeps British/Continental cross animals. The cow-calf operation is located on 12,338 ac with sandy loam soils. The climate is dry and semi-arid. Mean annual temperature is $13^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and mean annual precipitation is 390 mm , with the majority falling between MaySeptember. Additional farm revenue is generated from lease hunting.


## Production System and Physical Performance Indicators

## Similarities

Comparison of MB-2 and US-210-0 was chosen for similar herd size, retained ownership, and select performance characteristics. While the farms experience similar climatic conditions and precipitation patterns, mean annual temperature is considerably higher on US-210-0.

## Cow Performance and Weaning

Mature cow weight is similar on both farms, at $1,272 \mathrm{lb}$ on MB-2 and 1,250 lb on US-210-0. Calves are weaned at a similar age, though are considerably heavier on US-210-0 ( 530 lb ) than MB-2 $(487 \mathrm{lb}$ ). This is reflected in the 200d adjusted weaning weight, and weaning weight as a \% of mature cow weight.

Calf death loss is similarly low ( $1.0 \%$ on MB-1 and $2.0 \%$ on US-210-0), and calves weaned per 100 cows is comparable ( 92 and 93 calves on MB-2 and US-210-0, respectively).

| Beef cows (hd) | MB-2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Breeds | 225 | US-210-0 |
|  | Purebred Charolais, <br> Angus, Simmental, <br> Commercial | British/Continental <br> crosses |
| Mature cow weight (lb) | 1,273 | 1,250 |
| Weaning age (d) | 206 | 210 |
| Weaning weight (lb) | 487 | 530 |
| 200 day adjusted weaning weight (lb) | 473 | 505 |
| Weaning weight as \% mature cow weight | 38 | 42 |
| Price per head for weaners sold (\$/hd) | 1,272 | 1,262 |
| Calf death loss | $1.0 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| Calves weaned per 100 cows (hd) | 92 | 93 |
| Replacement rate (\%) | $8.0 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Annual sales (hd) | 160 | 149 |
| Income sources | Cow-calf, retained | Cow-calf, lease |
|  | ownership | hunting |

## Cattle Sales and Prices

MB-2 and US-210-0 receive similar prices for weaned calves, at $\$ 1,272 /$ head and $\$ 1,262 /$ head, respectively. This is in spite of differences in weaning weights. Both farms then retain animals for further feeding. MB-2 retains calves for 180d pre-conditioning, and sells 160 head of backgrounded animals annually. US-210-0 retains weaned calves for backgrounding, and sells an average 149 head per year.

Feeding
On MB-2, winter diets for cows include corn silage, hay, straw, pellets, grain, salt and mineral, $11 \%$ of provided feedstuffs are purchased. Cows are fed in confinement over winter. On US-210-0, differences in local weather allow cows to be kept outdoors year-round. All land on US-210-0 is in pasture, with some supplemental feed purchased.

## Cow-calf Enterprise

## Cost and Profit

For comparison of costs and profits, a 5-year average (2016-2020) is used. Total production costs of the cow-calf enterprise (including cash cost, depreciation, and opportunity cost) on MB-2 averaged $\$ 824 /$ cow. On US-210-0, average production costs were $\$ 1,613 /$ cow, almost twice the total costs incurred on MB-2.

Cash costs include purchased feed, cost of feed production including seed and fertilizer, land rent, wages, machine and building maintenance, interest on liabilities, veterinary and medicine costs, etc. These costs account for 75\% of costs on MB-2, and 52\% of costs on US-210-0.

Depreciation on machinery, buildings, etc., account for only $1 \%$ of total costs on MB-2, and 7\% of costs on US-210-0. This is the smallest share of total costs.

| Total costs of the cow-calf enterprise |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Costs (\$/cow) | MB-2 | US-210-0 |
| Cash costs | 614 | 833 |
| Depreciation | 12 | 107 |
| Opportunity cost | 198 | 674 |
| Land | 38 | 360 |
| Labour | 160 | 240 |
| Capital | 0 | 74 |
| Total cost | 824 | 1,613 |
| Revenue | 940 | 1,149 |
| Short-term profit | 326 | 316 |
| Medium-term profit | 314 | 210 |
| Long-term profit | 116 | -464 |



■ Opportunity cost

- Depreciation
- Cash costs
- Revenue

Opportunity costs are calculated for unpaid family labour, owned land, and capital. These costs account for 24\% of costs on MB-2, and 42\% of costs on US-210-0. On MB-2, opportunity cost of labour is the largest share (81\%) of opportunity costs. On this farm, all labour hours are unpaid family labour. On US-210-0, opportunity cost of land accounts for more than half ( $53 \%$ ) of opportunity costs, which represents potential revenue gained from alternative uses of owned land, such as renting land to neighbours.

Revenue from the cow-calf enterprise, including weaned calf and cull sales, was an average $\$ 940 / \mathrm{cow}$. Cowcalf revenue is $\mathbf{2 2 \%}$ larger on US-210-0, at an average of $\$ 1,149 /$ cow over the 5 -year period.

Both MB-2 and US-210-0 are able to maintain profitability of the cow-calf enterprise in both the short- and medium-terms. Short-term profits (revenue - cash costs) averaged $\$ 326 /$ cow and $\$ 316 /$ cow for MB-2 and US-210-0, respectively. Medium-term profits (revenue - cash and depreciation costs) averaged \$214/cow on MB-2, and $\$ 210 /$ cow on US-210-0. Only MB-2 is profitable in the long-term, with average long-term profits (revenue - cash, depreciation, and opportunity costs) of $\$ 116 /$ cow. In contrast, US-210-0 saw an average long-term profit of - $\$ 464 /$ cow over the 5 -year period.

## Cost Structure

Total costs can be broken down as land, labour, capital, and non-factor costs. As with total production costs, total land, labour, capital, and non-factor costs on a per-cow basis are all higher on US-210-0. There is, however, variation in cost structure between the two farms, wherein these costs are reported as a percentage of total costs.

Land costs account for 14\% of total costs on MB-2, and 27\% of costs on US-210-0. MB-2 pays significantly higher per-acre land costs. On this farm, rents paid are $\$ 14 / \mathrm{ac}$, and rents calculated for owned land are \$49/ac. In contrast, land rents are \$8/ac on US-210-0 (both rented and calculated for owned land). Despite this, land costs are considerably higher on US-210-0 due to total land acres, as the cow-calf enterprise on this farm has almost nine times the land base ( $12,338 \mathrm{ac}$ ) as that on MB-2 (1,390 ac).

Labour costs account for 19\% of total costs on MB-2, and 16\% of total costs on US-210-0. Total labour hours on MB-2 are 1,821 hr, with 100\% of hours being unpaid family labour.

| Costs (\$/cow) | MB-2 | US-210-0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total land cost | 117 | 441 |
| Total labour cost | 160 | 252 |
| Total capital cost | 63 | 124 |
| Non-factor costs | 485 | 796 |
| Animal purchases | 21 | 88 |
| Feed | 252 | 297 |
| Machinery | 46 | 164 |
| Fuel, energy, lubricants | 20 | 24 |
| Buildings | 18 | 5 |
| Vet \& medicine | 34 | 34 |
| Insurance, taxes | 19 | 59 |
| Other inputs | 75 | 126 |
| Total costs | 824 | 1,613 |

On US-210-0, total labour hours are 2,786, almost 50\% more than on MB-2. US-210-0 uses both hired and unpaid family labour; 95\% of total labour hours are from unpaid family labour. Labour prices on the two farms are comparable, at $\$ 19.72 / \mathrm{hr}$ on $\mathbf{M B}-\mathbf{2}$ and $\$ 19.92 / \mathrm{hr}$ on US-210-0.

Capital costs account for $8 \%$ of total costs on both MB-2 and US-210-0, the smallest share of total costs. On MB-2, all capital costs incurred are interest on liabilities. On US-210-0, more than half ( $60 \%$ ) of capital costs are own capital, with the remainder as interest on liabilities (40\%).


Non-factor costs are the largest component of total costs on both farms, accounting for 59\% and 49\% of total costs on MB-2 and US-210-0, respectively. On both farms, feed costs are the most significant non-factor cost. These account for $52 \%$ of non-factor and $30 \%$ of total costs on MB-2, and for $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ of non-factor and $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ of total costs on US-210-0. The majority of feed costs ( $87 \%$ ) on MB-2 are for purchased feed, with the remainder for inputs for feed production, such as seed and fertilizer, and land improvement. On US-210-0, feed costs are entirely for purchased feed. Machinery costs are also significant on both farms, accounting for 10\% of non-factor costs on MB-2 and 21\% on US-210-0. On MB-2, a large share of machinery costs is associated with contract labour, whereas on US-210-0 these costs are mostly as depreciation.

## Whole Farm

## Other Farm Enterprises

Both MB-2 and US-210-0 retain ownership of weaned calves. However, the preconditioning enterprise is reported separately on MB-2, whereas backgrounded calves area included as part of the cow-calf enterprise on US-210-0. US-210-0 does, however, generate additional revenue from other farm activities.

## Cost and Profit

Total farm revenue on MB-2 averaged $\$ 427,562$ over the 5-year period. Of total-farm revenue, $49 \%$ is attributed to market revenue from the cow-calf enterprise, with the remained from the pre-conditioning enterprise. On US-210-0, total farm revenue averaged $\$ 274,900$, of which $93 \%$ is market revenue from the cow-calf enterprise (included backgrounded animals). The remainder of total farm revenue is generated by other farm activities.

Total farm expenses on MB-2 averaged \$376,455 over the 5-year period. Half of total farm expenses were incurred by the retained ownership enterprise, with the cow-calf enterprise accounting for $20 \%$ of total expenses. In contrast, cow-calf enterprise accounted for 48\% of total expenses on US-210-0. On this farm, total farm expenses averaged $\$ 212,748$ over the 5-year period.

| Whole-farm cost and profit <br> Costs (\$) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Revenue | 430,509 | 256,719 |
| Market revenue | 211,545 | 256,719 |
| Cow-calf | 218,963 | 0 |
| Retained ownership | 0 | 0 |
| Cash crop | 0 | 18,181 |
| Other farm revenue | 0 | 0 |
| Government payments | $-2,947$ | 0 |
| Change in inventory | 427,562 | 274,900 |
| Total farm revenue | 5,333 | 25,918 |
| Expenses | 34,757 | 52,710 |
| Depreciation | 47,482 | 32,217 |
| Fixed costs | 76,043 | 101,903 |
| Wages, rent, interest | 191,886 | 0 |
| Cow-calf | 20,954 | 0 |
| Retained ownership | 376,455 | 212,748 |
| Cash crop |  |  |
| Total farm costs | 51,107 | 62,152 |
| Profits | 59,387 | 87,822 |
| Net income |  |  |
| Net cash farm income |  |  |

Both MB-2 and US-210-0 maintained whole-farm profitability over the 5-year period. This is in contrast to a cow-calf enterprise that was unprofitable in the long-term on US-210-0. At whole-farm level, including the cow-calf and pre-conditioning enterprises, net income for MB-2
averaged $\$ 51,107^{\text {a }}$, and net cash farm income averaged $\$ 59,387^{\text {b }}$. On US-210-0, net income averaged $\$ 62,152^{\text {a }}$, and net cash farm income averaged $\$ 87,822^{\text {b }}$ over the five-year period.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ This is whole farm profitability, calculated as Market returns (+ coupled payments) (+ decoupled payments) - whole-farm costs +/- changes in inventory +/- capital gains/losses. Whole-farm costs include Direct costs enterprises, overhead costs, paid labour, paid rents, paid interest, depreciation
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Net cash farm income $=$ Whole farm profitability + depreciation + changes in inventory + capital gains/losses.

