

## Case Study - SK-5 vs. US-160-0

## Farm Descriptions

SK-5 is a mixed cow-calf and cash crop operation located in Saskatchewan, Canada, within the Moist Mixed Grassland ecoregion. This farm has purebred and commercial animals, and maintains a beef cow herd of 135 head. The cow-calf enterprise is situated on 2,193 ac with dark brown chernozemic soils over glacial till. The climate is semi-arid. Mean annual temperature is $2.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and mean annual precipitation range is $350-400 \mathrm{~mm}$, with highest rainfall in May-June.

US-160-0 is a mixed cow-calf and cash crop operation located in Kansas, United States. This farm keeps 159 head of beef cows to maintain its commercial herd. The cow-calf enterprise is situated on 1,721 ac with silt loam soils. The climate is dry semi-arid. Mean annual temperature is $6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and mean annual precipitation is 396 mm . The main period of precipitation is AprilSeptember, peaking in June.


## Production System and Physical Performance Indicators

## Similarities

Comparison of SK-5 and US-160-0 was chosen as these are mixed cow-calf and cash crop operations with medium sized herds, under similar climatic conditions for crop production.

## Cow Performance and Weaning

Mature cow weight on SK-5 is $1,499 \mathrm{lb}, 25 \%$ heavier than the $1,200 \mathrm{lb}$ mature cows on US-160-0. SK-5 weans calves approximately 4.5 weeks younger, at a lighter weight, and therefor at a lower percentage of mature cow weight, than on US-160-0. The 200d adjusted weaning weights ( 682 lb on SK-5, 619 lb on US-160-0), though, show heavier calves on SK-5.

Calf death loss is slightly higher on US-160-0 (5.0\%) than on SK-5 (3.0\%), though US-160-0 weans more calves per 100 cows (92) than SK-5 (89). This may suggest differences in fertility between farms. A slightly higher calving percentage on US-160-0 (96\%) as compared to SK-5 (92\%) may support this.

## Cattle Sales and Prices

Both SK-5 and US-160-0 sell calves at weaning. SK-5 sells weaned calves at 611 lb , at an average price of $\$ 1,182 /$ head. On US-160$\mathbf{0}$, weaners at sold at 650 lb for an average price of $\$ 1,123 /$ head. This is 5\% less than prices received on SK-5, despite a 6\% larger

|  | SK-5 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Beef cows (hd) | 135 | 159 |
| Breeds | Purebred Charolais <br> Angus, Simmental; <br> Commercial | Crosses |
|  | 1,300 |  |
| Mature cow weight (lb) | 179 | 1,200 |
| Weaning age (d) | 611 | 210 |
| Weaning weight (lb) | 682 | 650 |
| 200 day adjusted weaning weight (lb) | 47 | 619 |
| Weaning weight as \% mature cow weight | $3.0 \%$ | 54 |
| Calf death loss | 89 | $5.0 \%$ |
| Calves weaned per 100 cows (hd) | $13.5 \%$ | 92 |
| Replacement rate (\%) | 1,182 | $12.0 \%$ |
| Price per head for weaners sold (\$/hd) | $30 \%$ | 1,123 |
| Feed purchased (\%) | Cow-calf, crop | Cow-calf, crop |
| Income sources |  | $7 \%$ |
|  |  |  | sale weight.

Feeding
On SK-5, following a period of aftermath grazing in fall, cows receive a winter diet consisting of cereal silage, hay, straw and chaff, cereal screening, camelina meal, salt, and mineral. Winter diets are provided on pasture. On US-160-0, cows graze throughout the year, but are supplemented with grass hay/silage in winter (55\%). SK-5 purchases 30\% of feedstuffs provided, and US-160-0 purchases 7\%.

## Cow-calf Enterprise

## Cost and Profit

For comparison of cow-calf 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 SK-5 averaged $\$ 1,810 /$ cow over the 5 -year period. This is $40 \%$ larger than total costs incurred on US-160-0, at an average of $\$ 1,288 /$ cow.

Cash costs include purchased feed, costs of feed production including seed and fertilizer, land rent, wages, machine and building maintenance, interest on liabilities, veterinary and medicine costs, etc. Cash costs make up a considerable share of total costs on both farms. These account for 64\% of total costs on SK-5, and 78\% of total costs on US-160-0.

Depreciation on machinery, building, etc., accounts for a smaller share of total costs, at 10\%

| Total costs of the cow-calf enterprise |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Costs (\$/cow) | SK-5 | US-160-0 |
| Cash costs | 1,160 | 1,009 |
| Depreciation | 172 | 49 |
| Opportunity cost | 478 | 230 |
| Land | 188 | 125 |
| Labour | 290 | 91 |
| Capital | 0 | 14 |
| Total cost | 1,810 | 1,288 |
| Revenue | 1,085 | 1,041 |
| Short-term profit | -74 | 33 |
| Medium-term profit | -246 | -17 |
| Long-term profit | -725 | -247 | and 4\% of total costs on SK-5 and US-160-0, respectively.



- Revenue

Opportunity costs are calculated for owned land, unpaid family labour, and capital. On SK-5, the largest opportunity cost ( $61 \%$ of opportunity cost) is opportunity cost of labour. This is due to a large number of unpaid family labour hours on this farm. On US-160-0, over half (54\%) of opportunity costs is opportunity cost of land. This cost represents potential revenue generated 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 $\$ 1,085 /$ cow on SK- 5 . This is comparable to cow-calf revenue on US-160-0, of $\$ 1,041 /$ cow. Considering that cow-calf production costs are $40 \%$ larger on SK-5, this will be reflected in profitability measures of the respective cow-calf enterprises.

The cow-calf enterprise on SK-5 is unprofitable in all of the short-, medium-, and long-terms. Average shortterm profits (revenue - cash costs) on this farm were -\$74/cow. Average medium-term profits (revenue - cash and depreciation costs) were - $\$ 246 /$ cow, and average long-term profits (revenue - cash, depreciation, and opportunity costs) were - $\$ 724 /$ cow. US $-\mathbf{1 6 0} 0$ - 0 is able to cover short-term (cash) costs, with an average shortterm profit of $\$ 33 /$ cow. However, this farm, too, is unprofitable in the medium- and long-terms. Medium-term profits averaged - $\$ 17 /$ cow, and long-term profits $-\$ 247 /$ cow over the 5 -year period.

## Cost Structure

Total costs can be broken down as land, labour, capital, and non-factor costs. Per-cow total land costs are higher on US-160-0, while total labour, capital, and non-factor costs are higher on SK-5. Cost structure, wherein these costs are presented as a percentage of total costs, is also variable between the two farms.

Land costs account for $13 \%$ of total costs on SK-5, and 40\% of total costs on US-160-0. While US-60-0 maintains a smaller land-base (1,721 ac) than SK-5 (1,293 ac), and a smaller cow herd, per-cow land costs are over twice that of SK-5. This is due to differences in land rents. Between rents paid and rents calculated for owned land, average land rents are \$48/ac on US-160-0, as compared to \$14/ac on SK-5.

Labour costs account for 29\% of total costs on SK-5, and only 8\% of total costs on US-1600. Total labour hours on SK-5 are 3,331 hrs, over 6 times the total labour hours logged on US-160-0 ( 530 hrs ). The difference in total labour hours overcomes the difference in

| Costs (\$/cow) | SK-5 | US-160-0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total land cost | 240 | 510 |
| Total labour cost | 521 | 109 |
| Total capital cost | 176 | 20 |
| Non-factor costs | 873 | 648 |
| Animal purchases | 35 | 17 |
| Feed | 232 | 345 |
| Machinery | 94 | 47 |
| Fuel, energy, lubricants | 130 | 41 |
| Buildings | 104 | 3 |
| Vet \& medicine | 25 | 36 |
| Insurance, taxes | 54 | 0 |
| Other inputs | 199 | 161 |
| Total costs | 1,810 | 1,288 |

labour prices, which are higher on US-160-0, at an average $\$ 28.77 / \mathrm{hr}$, as compared to $\$ 21.46 / \mathrm{hr}$ on SK-5. Both farms utilize both hired and unpaid family labour. Unpaid family labour hours account for $46 \%$ and $68 \%$ of total labour hours on SK-5 and US-160-0, respectively.

Capital costs are the smallest share of total costs on both farms. Capital costs account of $10 \%$ of total costs on SK-5, of which all costs are interest on liabilities. On US-160-0, capital costs account for only $2 \%$ of total costs, with the majority of capital costs (67\%) as own capital.


Non-factor costs account for the largest share of total costs, at $48 \%$ of total costs on SK-5, and a similar 50\% of total costs on US-160-0. On both farms, the most significant non-factor costs are feed costs. These account for $27 \%$ of non-factor and $13 \%$ of total costs on SK-5, and $53 \%$ of nonfactor and $\mathbf{2 7 \%}$ of total costs on US-160-0. Despite differences in amount of feed purchased, purchased feed is the feed cost on both farms, followed by inputs for homegrown feed production. Other significant non-factor costs on SK-5 are fuel, energy, and lubricants ( $15 \%$ of nonfactor costs), primarily diesel for vehicles, and building costs (12\%). On US-160-0, general farm maintenance and spare parts (classified as "other" cow-calf inputs) is the next-largest non-factor costs ( $\$ 92 /$ cow or $14 \%$ of non-factor costs).

## Whole Farm

## Other Farm Enterprises

In addition to the cow-calf enterprise, both SK-5 and US-160-0 generate additional farm revenue from a cash crop enterprise, as well as other farm activities. US-160-0 also receives government payments.

## Cost and Profit

Total farm revenue on SK-5 averaged \$158,107 over the 5 -year period. Market revenue from the cow-calf enterprise accounted for $93 \%$ of whole-farm revenue, followed by the cash crop enterprise (6\%), and other farm activities (1\%). Total farm revenue on US-160-0 averaged $\$ 986,976$ over the 5 -year period, over 6 times the total revenue on SK-5. On US-160-0, the majority of farm revenue ( $75 \%$ ) is market revenue from the cash crop enterprise. Only $17 \%$ of revenue is market revenue from the cowcalf enterprise.

Total farm expenses on SK-5 averaged \$185,209 over the 5 -year period. Wages, rent, and interest were the largest expenses incurred on this farm ( $34 \%$ of total expenses), followed by fixed costs (24\%), and the cow-calf enterprise (18\%). On US-160-0, total farm expenses averaged $\$ 540,177$. Similar to total costs, the cash crop enterprise is the largest source of expenses on this farm (55\%). This is followed by wages, rent, and interest (24\%), and the cow-calf enterprise (13\%).

| Whole-farm cost and profit <br> Costs (\$) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Revenue | SK-5 | US-160-0 |
| Market revenue | 156,367 | 907,116 |
| Cow-calf | 146,509 | 165,536 |
| Cash crop | 9,858 | 741,580 |
| Other farm revenue | 1,667 | 58,527 |
| Government payments | 0 | 21,334 |
| Total farm revenue | 158,034 | 986,976 |
| Expenses |  |  |
| Depreciation | 24,104 | 45,737 |
| Fixed costs | 44,843 |  |
| Wages, rent, interest | 63,883 | 127,206 |
| Cow-calf | 33,276 | 67,772 |
| Crop production | 19,102 | 299,463 |
| Total farm costs | 185,209 | 540,177 |
| Profits |  |  |
| Net income | $-27,175$ | 446,799 |
| Net cash farm income | $-3,070$ | 491,541 |

The cow-calf enterprise on SK-5 was not profitable in the short-, medium-, or long-terms. Despite the additional farm revenue from the cash crop enterprise and other farm activities, SK-5 remains unprofitable at the whole-farm level. Average net income for SK-5 was - $\$ 27,175^{a}$ over the 5 -year period, and average net cash farm income was - $\$ 3,070$. In contrast, the success of the cash crop enterprise, as well as additional revenue from other farm activities and government payments received by US-160-0, allow this farm to achieve whole-farm level profitability. Over the 5 -year period, net income averaged $\$ 446,799^{a}$, and net farm cash income averaged $\$ 491,541^{\text {b }}$.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ 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.

