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# Net Incomes and Resource Valuations of Optimum Organizations 

for
Dairy Farms in Northern New England
by
David H. Harrington and Richard A. Andrews*

## I. The Problem and Approach

Quantities of resources used, quality of cows, and the price of milk greatly influence the organization, level of income, and value of resources used on dairy farms. The proportion in which resources are combined, as well as the total quantity of resources used, strongly modifies the farm's business and income. Differences in quality of cows has long been noted and in this analysis is represented by different milk response to hay and grain feeding functions.

The objective of this study is to assess the influence of quantities of resources, quality of dairy cows, and price of milk on Northern New England dairy farms. The specific objectives are:
(1) To determine the optimum organizations for situations involving different quantities of resources, milk responses of cows, and milk prices.
(2) To determine the potential levels of income for these resource combinations with three different milk prices.
(3) To determine the value of additional amounts of major resources to farms with differing quantities of resources, milk responses, and milk prices.

[^1]A linear programming model was developed to reflect the alternatives open to specialized dairy farms. Multiple solutions were obtained for discrete levels of cropland and cow numbers for each of three milk response functions at three milk prices. One series of solutions was run assuming an opportunity to sell hay and a second series was run without the opportunity to sell hay.

These solutions reflect opportunities associated with differences in resource and price combinations on farms in the study areas. This approach provides more usable results than the alternative of determining typical farm situations for analysis. Most farms in the study area will resemble one of the programmed farm situations in amount of resources, milk response, and milk price. This approach has the added advantage that it compares various combinations of resources to determine the better resource combinations and evaluate farm adjustment alternatives.

This analysis represents "should be" situations rather than "would be" actions. In other words, it is concerned with what a farmer "ought to do" if his objective is maximizing the return to his fixed factors; and his resources, prices, and, constraints are as stated in the linear programming model.

## Study Areas

The study areas are comprised of parts of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont.* These areas are relatively homogeneous in respect to crop response and available alternatives both within and outside dairy farming. The farms are generally on rolling hills of varied, somewhat acid, soil associations; temperature and rainfall differences within the study areas are minor. Dairy farms in these areas are generally specialized in the production of fluid milk for sale both locally and in the Boston market.

Figure 1 shows the areas to which this study applies. Farms in the river valleys (notably the Connecticut River Valley) have significantly different yields than those assumed in this study. Thus, the results apply to farms in the designated areas excluding farms in the river valleys.

## Organization

Section II presents a short description of the production and price data and the alternatives considered in the linear programming model. The results of analysis make up section III, IV, and V. Section III presents optimum dairy farm organizations of resources at three milk prices. Possible adjustments of resources for a specific farm can be assessed by comparing its existing organization under the present resource and price situation with the optimum organization presented

[^2]in this section. Section IV evaluates the net income potential of different resource packages under the three milk prices. The analysis of net incomes points out longer-run adjustments when the quantity of cropland and dairy cows and the milk response may be changed. Section V covers the valuation of resorces. Methods of finding breakeven price differentials between cows of different milk responses are presented as well as a method of determining the optimum ratio of cows to cropland. Section VI presents the summary and conclusions.


Figure 1. Study Areas

## II. The Framework and Assumptions of the Study

Crop and livestock alternatives typical of most dairy farms are represented in a generalized linear programming model. The differences between farm situations are reflected in number of cows per acre of cropland, milk response functions, and milk prices. Each solution of the model represents the optimum organization for a given package of resources. The adjustments to the cropping patterns within these solutions may take up to 3 years to complete.

A general explanation of the alternatives and factor relations of the linear programming model follows.*

## Forage Crops

Three species of forage may be seeded: an alfalfa-grass mixture, a clover-grass mixture, and corn for silage. Where clover-grass and alfalfa-grass revert to grass over a period of years, four alternative stands of hay or pasture are available to the farmer:
(1) Five-year alfalfa-grass
(2) Two-year clover-grass
(3) Three- to five-year grass following clover-grass
(4) Six- to twelve-year grass following either alfalfa grass or three- to five-year grass
Stands of hay which yielded less than 0.3 tons of hay equivalent per acre on any single cutting were not harvested. Yields at three fertility levels were adjusted for losses of harvesting, storing, and feeding (either hay or pasture). To allow maximum flexibility in the feeding program, each stand (species and fertility level could be harvested as:
(1) Three cuts of hay
(2) Two cuts of hay plus fall aftermath
(3) One cutting of hay plus pasture and fall aftermath
(4) Full season pasture

Reseeded acres involve a nurse crop of oats which was pastured in July and August.

The crop alternatives required 29 forage harvesting processes, three drylot feeding processes, four reseeding processes, and two corn silage processes. The hay produced in these processes could be fed to dairy cows and replacements or, in one series of solutions, it could be sold at $\$ 27$ per ton.

## The Dairy Herd

Forage fed to dairy cows and replacements could be in any proportion of pasture, hay and corn silage above a minimum of 1 ton of hay per cow per year. In addition, forage from pasture was limited to

[^3]what the herd could consume during the pasture season. The slope of each milk response reflects only the change in milk output due to changing forage and grain inputs. Six combinations of grain and forage feeding were included as processes for each of the three milk response functions.

One dairy replacement was required for every four cows. This assumes a 4 -year herd life for milking cows. The replacements could be either purchased or raised. Replacements could be raised in competition with dairy cows for such resources as stall space and forage or, in each model, a few replacements could be raised in housing not suitable for milking cows and could be pastured in fields not accessible to dairy cows or not suited for hay.

The heifer calf crop was assumed to be 40 calves available to be raised as replacements per 100 cows. The balance of the heifers available for raising as replacements over the replacement requirements could be raised and sold or could be sold at birth.

Other intermediate products and joint products of a dairy farm were considered as saleable. These were hay, cull cows, and bull calves. Hay, heifer calves, and replacements were sold through a sales process. However, the sale of cull cows and bull calves was accomplished by subtracting the net return from these alternatives from the cost of keeping a dairy cow. The reason for the different handling of these products stems from the assumption that hay and replacements could be sold in various quantities as determined in the solution, but cull cows and bull calves had to be sold in a fixed proportion with the number of dairy cows kept. Finally, all milk produced was sold through a milk sale process. Table 1 lists the factors which are considered fixed, the factors which are considered variable, the intermediate products, and the saleable products for each single solution in the linear programming model.

## Resource Supplies and Restrictions

In this analysis the cropland resources were held constant at 100 acres of cropland of which 50 acres were suitable for corn or alfalfa, and 25 acres were suitable for production of alfalfa. The silo capacity available was not a restriction and was set to be greater than required if all corn land ( 50 acres) were planted to corn.

The labor hours supplied by the farm family were taken to be 2,252 hours per year. This figure does not include any allowance for overhead time for such tasks as plowing sinow, keeping records, repairing buildings, attending meetings, etc. This net labor time was distributed throughout four labor periods in proportion to the number of days in each period. The labor available in each period is only that proportion of the total labor which may be devoted to performing the specific operations required by each process.
Table 1. Fixed factors, variable factors, intermediate products and saleable products in each solution of the linear programming model

The stall spaces, cows on hand, and replacements were varied within each milk response and milk price combination to allow varying intensity of operation. These restrictions were kept in nearly constant ratio to each other while solving with varying ratios of cows per crop acre. Table 2 shows the values of restrictions for different cow cropland ratios.

## Production and Price Data

Most of the production and price data for this study was developed by the Northeast Dairy Adjustment Research Committee.* The rates of performance and costs of operating machines were developed from engineering data by this committee. Yields and responses to fertilizer were developed in cooperation with agronomists. The level of crop response is intended to reflect the yields and costs associated with the top 25 percent of farmers in 1961.** This level of crop response is also intended to be a projection of the yield and variable cost structure which will be typical of the study area in 1970.

Milk response functions were developed from the milk production and feeding data of the Lake States Dairy Adjustment Study, the Northeast Adjustment Study, and an unpublished master's thesis from the University of New Hampshire (Table 3).

The low milk response function developed for the Northeast Dairy Adjustment Study reflects the milk response of cows of the average ability of 1961. It starts at a milk production of 7,230 pounds at the lowest level of grain feeding and rises quite sharply to 8,550 pounds of milk at the 2,500 pound grain feeding level. Below 2,500 pounds of grain, the response to grain feeding is higher because the animal is not fed to her stomach capacity. From 8,550 pounds of milk to the maximum milk production of 9,440 pounds, this response has the same slope as the medium milk response function. This lesser slope indicates cows are fed to their stomach capacity.

[^4]Table 2. Resource restrictions in the linear programming model

| Ratio of cows/crop/acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Unit | . 10 | . 15 | . 20 | . 25 | . 30 | . 35 | . 40 | . 45 | . 50 | . 55 | . 60 |
| Cows | No. | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 |
| Stalls for cows | No. | 12 | 18 | 24 | 30 | 36 | $4{ }^{2}$ | 48 | 54 | 60 | 66 | 72 |
| Stalls for replacements | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| Total stalls available | No. | 13 | 20 | 27 | 34 | 41 | 48 | 55 | 62 | 69 | 76 | 83 |
| Cropland | Acre | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Operator labor | Hr . | 2,254 | 2,254 | 2,254 | 2,254 | 2,254 | 2,254 | 2,254 | 2,254 | 2,254 | 2,254 | 2,254 |

Table 3. Milk response functions for high, medium, and low quality cows*

| High** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grain (pounds) | 1500 | $\because 000$ | 2500 | 3000 | 3500 | 4000 |
| Forage (pounds TDN) | 6062 | 6000 | 5938 | 5805 | 5805 | 5725 |
| Milk (pounds) | 10,200 | 10,500 | 10,775 | 11,025 | 11,225 | 11,375 |
| Medium* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grain (pounds) | 1500 | 2000 | 2500 | 3000 | 3500 | 4000 |
| Forage (pounds TDN) | 5570 | 5455 | 5335 | 5200 | 5055 | 4895 |
| Milk (pounds) | 9160 | 9615 | 10,000 | 10,320 | 10,575 | 10,780 |
| Low ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grain (pounds) | 1500 | 2000 | 2500 | 3000 | 3500 | 4000 |
| Forage (pounds TDN) | 5285 | 5235 | 5180 | 5000 | 4805 | 4570 |
| Milk (pounds) | 7230 | 7925 | 8550 | 8900 | 9195 | 9440 |

[^5]The medium milk response function, developed by Jensen and others starts at a milk production of 9,160 pounds at the 1,500 -pound level of grain feeding and rises with a steadily diminishing slope to 10,780 pounds of milk at the 4,000 -pound grain level. This response function reflects the milk production and response associated with cows of average production of 1965 which are fed to their stomach capacity.

The high milk response function adapted from an unpublished master's thesis at the University of New Hampshire starts at 10,200 pounds of milk at the 1,500 -pound grain level and rises with a gradual slope to 11,375 pounds of milk at the 4,000 -pound grain level. The more gradual slope indicates a lower response to grain feeding in this response function.

The three milk response functions used in this analysis were independently determined. They reflect differences in feeding and management as well as differences in quality of cows. The functions were chosen primarily to reflect differences in their positions, with less attention paid to their slopes. These functions may suggest that higher quality cows exhibit less responsiveness to grain feeding; however, this conclusion cannot validly be drawn because of different sources of response data.

## III. Optimum Organizations

The influences of milk response, milk price, and cows per crop acre on farm organization was determined both separately and in combination. Table 4 and Appendix tables III 1 to 17 show summaries of the optimum organization of resources for each milk response, milk price and ratio of cows to cropland. Optimum farm organization - i.e., the manner and proportions in which available factors are combined in the production process - is discussed in three segments: the cropping pattern, the dairy herd, and the replacement program.

## The Cropping Pattern

As more cows are added to a fixed acreage of cropland, more forage must be produced per acre. Froduction of this forage requires a more intensive cropping pattern. Table 5 and figure 2 show the optimum cropping patterns at the various ratios of cows to crop acres. These patterns are stated in percentage utilization of 100 acres of cropland. In table 5 each block is a summary of the cropping patterns of all solutions at that ratio. The median and the limits of the range of percentage utilization are presented for each ratio of cows to cropland.

In figure 2 the optimum cropping pattern for a given cow cropland ratio can be read by drawing a vertical line connecting the given cow/cropland ratio. The intersection of the lines separating each crop with this vertical line will show the cumulative percentage of cropland used. For example, at the 0.30 ratio, corn silage occupies 16 percent of the cropland, alfalfa-grass at low fertilization occupies 10 percent ( 26 percent corn silage and alfalfa-grass minus 16 percent corn silage), clover-grass at zero fertilization occupies 24 percent ( 50 percent minus 26 percent alfalfa-grass and corn silage), 3-4-5-year grass at zero fertilization occupies 36 percent and seedings of alfalfa and clover occupy 2 percent and 12 percent, respectively.

The most extensive cropping patterns occur at the 0.10 and 0.15 ratios where sale of hay is not allowed. At these ratios no alfalfa or corn silage is produced and the meadow series of rotation is 2 years of clover followed by approximately 8 years of grass. No commercial fertilizer is used except in the seeding year and some cropland is left idle. From this extensive base the changes which occur as the ratio of cows to cropland is increased are:
(1) All cropland is utilized at the 0.20 ratio and above.
(2) The meadow series of the rotation is shortened to 5 years at the 0.25 ratio and above.
(3) Corn silage is steadily increased by displacing clover and $3-4-5$-year grass as the ratio of cows to cropland is increased.
(4) Alfalfa displaces clover and 3-4-5-year grass on land suited to producing alfalfa at the 0.30 ratio and above.
Table 4. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland, medium


Table 5. Optimum percentage utilization of cropland by species and level of fertilization with specified ratios of cows to cropland and market for hay.

| Ratio of cows to cropland | With hay sales at $\$ 27$ per ton |  |  | With hay sales prohibited (hay price $=\$ 0.00$ ) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Crop/fertilization | Median | Range | Crop/fertilization M | Median | Range |
| .10 Cows/crop acre |  |  |  |  | Pct. | Pct. |
|  | Corn Silage | 3 | 1-4 | Corn silage | 0 | 0 |
|  | Alfalfa/low |  | 21 | Alfalfa/low | 0 | 0 |
|  | Clover/low | 24 | 23-25 | Clover/zero | 13 | 13-14 |
|  | 3-4-5 grass/low | 36 | 36-37 | 3-4-5 Grass/zero | - 20 | 19-21 |
|  | Alfalfa seedings |  |  | 6-12 grass/zero | 12 | 9-14 |
|  | Clover seedings |  | 12 | Alfalfa seedings | S 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | Clover seedings | 7 | 6-7 |
|  |  |  |  | Idle cropland | 48 | 53-42 |
|  | Total | 100 |  | Tetal | 100 |  |
| . 15 Cows/crop acre | Corn silage | 6 | 5-8 | Corn soilage | 0 | 0 |
|  | Alfalfa low | $\bigcirc 1$ | 21 | Alfalfa/low |  | 0 |
|  | Clover low | 23 | 23-25 | Clover zero | 18 | 17-19 |
|  | 3-4-5 grass/low | 34 | 33-35 | 3-4-5 grass/zero | 27 | 25-29 |
|  | Alfalfa seedings | 4 | 4 | 6-12 grass/zero | 28 | 24-32 |
|  | Clover seeding | 12 | 11-12 | Alfalfa seedings | S 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | Clover seedings | 9 | 9-10 |
|  |  |  |  | Idle cropland | 18 | 25-9 |
|  | Total | 100 |  | Total | 100 |  |
| . 20 Cows/crop acre | Corn silage | 9 | 8-12 | Corn silage | 3 | 1-6 |
|  | Alfalfa low ${ }^{1}$ | 21 |  | Alfalfa/low | 0 | 0-1 |
|  | Clover/low | 22 | 21-22 | Clover/zero | 21 | 20-22 |
|  | 3-4-5 grass/low | 33 | 32-33 | 3-4-5 grass/zero | 32 | 30-33 |
|  | Alfalfa seedings | 4 | 4 | 6-12 grass/zero | 33 | 33-37 |
|  | Clover seedings | 11 | 10-11 | Alfalfa seedings | S 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | Clover seedings | 11 | 10-11 |
|  | Total | 100 |  | Total | 100 |  |
| . 25 Cows/crop acre | Corn silage | 12 | 11-15 | Corn silage | 8 | 6-12 |
|  | Alfalfa/low | 21 | 21 | Alfalfa/low | 0 | 0-1 |
|  | Clover low | 21 | 20-21 | Clover/zero | 29 | 27-31 |
|  | 3-4-5 grass/low | 32 | 30-32 | 3-4-5 grass zero | 44 | 41-46 |
|  | Alfalfa seedings | 4 | 4 | 6-12 grass/zero | 4 | 0-12 |
|  | Clover seedings | 10 | 10-11 | Alfalfa seedings | S 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | Clover seedings | 15 | 14-16 |
|  | Total | 100 |  | Total | 100 |  |
| . 30 Cows crop acre | Corn silage | 15 | 13-18 | Corn silage | 16 | 10-18 |
|  | Alfalfa low | 21 | 21 | Alfalfa/low | 10 | 5-21 |
|  | Clover/low | 20 | 21 | Clover/zero | 24 | 19-28 |
|  | 3-4-5 grass/low | 31 | 28-31 | 3-4-5 grass | 36 | 34-42 |
|  | Alfalfa seedings | 4 | 4 | Alfalfa seedings | - 2 | 1-4 |
|  | Clover seedings | 9 | 9-10 | Clover seedings | 12 | 10-14 |
|  | Total | 100 |  | Total | 100 |  |

[^6]Table 5. (Continued)

| Ratio of cows to cropland | With hay sales at $\$ 27$ per ton | With hay sales prohibited (hay price $=\$ 0.00$ ) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Crop/fertilization Median Range | Crop/fertilization m | Median | Range |
| . 35 Cows/crop acre | Pct. Pct. |  | Pct. | Pct. |
|  | Corn silage $\quad 19$ 16-21 | Corn silage | 19 | 16-21 |
|  | Alfalfa/low 21 | Alfalfa/low | 21 |  |
|  | Clover/low $\quad 19$ 18-20 | Clover/low | 19 | 18-20 |
|  | 3-4-5 grass/low 28 27-30 | 3-4-5 grass/low | 28 | 27-30 |
|  | Alfalfa seedings 4 | Alfalfa seedings | 4 |  |
|  | Clover seedings $\quad 9 \quad 9-10$ | Clover seedings | 9 | 9-10 |
|  | Total 100 | Total | 100 |  |
| . 40 Cows crop acre | No hay was sold at this ratio; thus, the solutions are identical in both series. | Corn silage Alfalfa/med. Clover/med. | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 21 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17-22 \\ & 21 \\ & 17-19 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | This ratio was beyond the maximum intensity for all milk response functions at the $\$ 4$ milk price. | 3-4-5 Grass/med. 28 $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Alfalfa seedings } & 4 \\ \text { Clover seedings } & 9\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 26-28 \\ 4 \\ 9-10 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total | 100 |  |
| . 45 Cows/crop acre | No hay was sold at this ratio; thus, the solutions are identical in both series. <br> This ratio was beyond the maximum intensity for all milk response functions at the $\$ 4$ milk price and the high \& low milk response functions at the $\$ 5$ milk price. | Corn silage Alfalfa/med. Clover/med. 3-4-5 grass/med. Alfalfa seedings Clover seedings <br> Total | $\begin{array}{r}21 \\ 21 \\ 18 \\ . \quad 27 \\ \hline \quad 4 \\ \hline 9 \\ \hline 100\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18-24 \\ & 21 \\ & 17-19 \\ & 26-28 \\ & 4 \\ & 9-10 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| . 50 Cows crop acre | No hay was sold at this ratio; thus, the solutions are identical in both series. <br> This ratio way beyond the maximum intensity for all milk response functions at the $\$ 4$ and $\$ 5$ milk prices and the high milk response function at the $\$ 6$ milk price. |  |  |  |
|  |  | Alfalfa med. | 21 |  |
|  |  | Clover med. | 18 | 18-19 |
|  |  | 3-4-5 Grass/med. | d. 27 | 27-28 |
|  |  | Alfalfa seedings Clover seedings | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{4}{9-10}$ |
|  |  | Total | 100 |  |
| . 55 Cows/crop acre | No hay was sold at this ratio; thus, the solutions are identical in both series. <br> Only the medium milk response function at the $\$ 6$ milk price attained this ratio. | Corn silage <br> Alfalfa/med. <br> Clover/med. <br> 3-4-5 grass/med. <br> Alfalfa seedings <br> Clover seedings | $\begin{array}{r}21 \\ 21 \\ 18 \\ . \\ \hline\end{array}$ | .... |
|  |  |  |  | .... |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\ldots$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total | 100 |  |



Figure 2. Optimum cropping program with specified ratios of cows to cropland and no market for hay.
(5) Reliance on supplemental hay feeding in the summer is steadily increased and pastured forage is steadily decreased as the ratio of cows to cropland is increased.
(6) The level of fertilization of each meadow species is increased to the low and then to the medium level of fertilization. The increase in level of fertilization occurs at different ratios for each species in each milk response and milk price combination; however, the order in which the levels of fertilization occur are the same.

In the series in which hay is sold, the alternative of harvesting three cuttings of hay is utilized a great deal. At ratios above 0.35 , the two series are identical; no hay is sold because the opportunity cost of utilizing it on the farm is too high. Below this ratio the alternative of selling hay at $\$ 27$ per ton prevents the plan from becoming more extensive.

Some general recommendations on adjusting cropping patterns can be obtained by ranking these adjustments from lowest to highest opportunity cost. In order, these adjustments are:
(1) Utilize all available cropland.
(2) Add a few acres of corn silage. Corn silage should be steadily increased in acreage as more cows are added.
(3) Shorten the meadow series of the rotation to 5 years.
(4) Add alfalfa at the low level of fertilization.
(5) Begin to utilize supplemental hay feeding in July and August. Supplemental hay feeding should be steadily increased as more cows are added.
(6) Increase the level of fertilization from no commerical fertilizer to the low level of fertilization.
(7) Stop selling hay. If the price of hay were higher than $\$ 27$ per ton, it would pay to intensify further before stopping hay sales.
(8) Plant 2 years of continuous corn on some land. The ratio of the acreage of corn silage to the acreage in new seedings exceeds 1.0 at this level of intensity.
(9) Increase the level of fertilization of alfalfa to the medium level.
(10) Increase the level of fertilization of clover and 3-4-5-year grass to the medium level.
(11) Decrease acreage harvested as pasture while continuing to increase supplemental hay feeding in all pasture periods.
The series of adjustments from (7) to (11) apply whether or not hay can be sold. The first six adjustments apply only when hay sales are not an alternative. When hay can be sold it pays to make the first six adjustments regardless of the ratio of the cows to cropland.

## Grain Feeding Levels

The quality of cows is a major determinant of the milk produced per cow and relative profitability of cows. It exerts little influence on the level of grain feeding. The high quality cows have a relatively low response to grain feeding due to the characteristics of the function used in this study.

The slope of the milk response functions for low, medium and high quality cows reflects the additional milk which is estimated to be produced with a given increase in grain fed. In determining optimum levels of grain feeding, the added income from milk sales and the reduced cost of forage are equated with the added cost of grain. The slope of the milk response function and the milk price largely determines the optimum level of grain feeding, because the reduced costs of forage are very small in comparison to the added cost of grain and the added income from milk sales. These reduced costs of forage alter the level of grain feeding only at very high and very low ratios of cows to cropland (see table 6 for all situations considered). The level of grain feeding may be reduced by 500 pounds at very extensive ratios where forage opportunity costs are low, or increased by 500 pounds at very intensive ratios where forage opportunity costs are high.

## The Replacement Program

Other alternatives in the dairy herd are production of replacements and disposition of the joint products - replacements and heifer calves. The alternatives available were:
(1) Buy all replacements required for the dairy herd.
(2) Raise replacements which can be raised with resources not accessible to dairy cows and purchase the balance required by the herd.
(3) Raise only the number of replacements required by the herd.
(4) Keep the maximum number of milk cows and raise enough replacements to fully utilize the stall space available.
(5) Raise the maximum number of replacements and keep only enough milk cows to fully utilize the stall space remaining. In this alternative replacements displace cows from available stall spaces.
The first alternative of buying all replacements is used only at the maximum intensity of cropland use with the high and medium milk response functions at the highest milk price. In these two solutions the opportunity costs of using the forage, grain, and labor to produce milk are great enough to exclude the raising of replacements entirely. All heifer calves are sold at birth in these two solutions.

The second alternative, that of raising replacements only with facilities not usable by dairy cows, is employed at high intensity ratios with the high and medium milk response functions at the $\$ 6.00$ and
Table 6. Optimum levels of grain feeding under specified conditions

| Price of milk | Quality of cows | Hay sales |  |  | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | . 10 | . 15 | . 20 | . 25 | . 30 | . 35 | . 40 | . 45 | . 50 | . 55 |
| \$6.00 | High | Permitted @Prohibited |  | \$27/ton | Pounds per cow per year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 2500 | 2500 |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$27/ton | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 2500 | 2500 | $\ldots$ |
|  | Medium | Permitted | @ |  | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3771 | 4000 |
|  |  | Prohibited | @ | \$27/ton | 2500 | 2500 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3771 | 4000 |
|  | Low | Permitted |  |  | 3500 | 3500 | 3500 | 3500 | 3500 | 3500 | 3814 | 4000 | 4000 |  |
|  |  | Prohibited |  |  | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3018 | 3500 | 3500 | 3814 | 4000 | 4000 |  |
| \$5.00 | High |  | @ | \$27/ton | Pounds per cow per year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Permitted |  |  | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | $\ldots$ |  |
|  |  | Prohibited |  |  | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | ........ |  |
|  | Medium | Permitted | @ | \$27/ton | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 3000 | 3000 |  |
|  |  | Prohibited |  | \$27/ton | 2000 | 2000 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 3000 | 3000 |  |
|  | Low | Permitted | @ |  | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3030 | 3500 |  |  |
|  |  | Prohibited |  |  | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 3000 | 3030 | 3500 |  |  |
| \$4.00 | High |  | @ | \$27/ton | Pounds per cow per year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Permitted |  |  | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | ........ | ....... |  |
|  |  | Prohibited |  |  | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | ........ | ........ |  |
|  | Medium | Permitted | @ | \$27/ton | 1500 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | ........ | ........ | ........ |  |
|  |  | Prohibited |  |  | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 2000 | ........ | ........ | ........ |  |
|  | Low | Permitted | @ | \$27/ton | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | $\ldots$ | ........ |  |
|  |  | Prohibited |  |  | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | .... |  |  |

$\$ 5.00$ milk prices. The balance of replacements required are purchased and the excess of heifer calves are sold at birth.

The third alternative, that of raising only as many replacements as are required by the herd and neither buying nor selling replacements is used in a few solutions at high intensity ratios. These solutions are on the high milk response functions at the $\$ 4.00$ milk price and the low milk response function at the $\$ 5.00$ milk price.

At all ratios of 0.30 cows per acre of cropland and below, replacements are raised and sold. In all solutions except those with the low milk response function at the $\$ 4.00$ milk price, replacements are raised only after the maximum number of cows for that situation are kept (alternative 4). In the solutions for the low milk response at the $\$ 4.00$ milk price the maximum number of heifer calves are raised as replacements and the balance above the replacement requirements are sold. Only enough cows to fully utilize the stall space are kept under this alternative.

## Summary of Optimum Organizations

It is important to note the relative importance of the influence of milk response, milk price, intensity ratio, and hay sales in determining farm organization. The ratio of cows to cropland appears to influence the organization most strongly, especially when hay sales is not a feasible alternative. The cow cropland ratio exerts a strong effect on the cropping pattern and the replacement program. As more cows are kept on a fixed acreage, the intensity of use of resources increase markedly.

The milk response function and the milk price are of about the same magnitude in influencing organization. Both exert their primary influence on the level of grain feeding. Each has some influence on the replacement program. Higher milk response functions and higher milk prices favor more intensive production of milk.

Listed in descending order of their influence on the overall organization, these factors are:
(1) The ratio of cows to cropland
(2) The presence or absence of the alternative of selling hay
(3) The slope of the milk response function
(4) The milk price
(5) The level of the milk response function

## IV. Net Incomes

Net income as used in this study refers to the income net of variable costs of production. Variable costs are purchased feed, seed, fertilizer, dairy supplies, electricity, gasoline, oil, hired labor, use depreciation of machinery and interest on capital used in production.

Net income thus defined is the residual amount left for covering fixed costs, such as interest on fixed capital, depreciation of buildings and machinery, insurance, taxes, and return to operator's labor and management. By maximizing the net income, one also maximizes residual return to the operators labor and management since the other costs are fixed in the time period under consideration.

## Net Income Functions

Figures 3, 4, and 5 compare net income functions for three milk prices; and 6, 7, and 8 compare net income functions for three milk responses. These net income functions show the income effects of adding more cows to a fixed acreage of cropland.

At the point at which hay sales become profitable, each net income function separates into two values. The higher function representing solutions in which hay was sold, is graphed from ten cows to the maximum net income attainable. The lower function. representing solutions in which hay sales were not allowed. is graphed from twenty cows to the maximum. The slopes of each of the net incomes functions decrease as more cows producing at the optimum on their milk response function are added to the fixed acreage. This indicates diminishing returns from auding resources to a fixed acreage.

Observation of figures 3,4 , and 5 shows that milk price has three distinct effects:
(1) A higher milk price raises the position of the net income function by a substantial amount;
(2) A higher milk price substantially increases the number of cows kept at the point of maximum net income;
(3) A higher milk price increases the slope of the net income function slightly.
These three effects are present with the milk response functions for each quality of cows, but are accentuated in the medium and low milk response functions.

Observing figures 6, 7, and 8 shows that the milk response function exerts influences similar to those of milk price, with the income response functions for high quality cows having steeper slopes.

The net income functions illustrate that farms with low quality cows and a low milk price cannot improve their incomes very much by adding cows. Farms with medium or high quality cows fare somewhat better under a low milk price; however, they do not have the


Figure 3. Net income functions for 100 acres of cropland and various numbers of low quality cows with 3 prices for milk and with and without hay sales.


Figure 4. Net income functions for 100 acres of cropland and various numbers of medium quality cows with 3 prices for milk and with and without hay sales.


Figure 5. Net income functions for 100 acres of cropland and various numbers of high quality cows with 3 prices of milk and with and without hay sales.


Figure 6. Net income functions for 100 acres of cropland and various numbers of low, medium or high quality cows with a milk price of $\$ 4.00$ per cwt. and with and without hay sales.


Figure 7. Net income functions for 100 acres of cropland and various numbers of low, medium or high quality cows with a milk price of $\$ 5.00$ per cwt. and with and without hay sales.


Figure 8. Net income functions for 100 acres of cropland and various numbers of low, medium or high quality cows with a milk price of $\$ 6.00$ per cwt. and with and without hay sales.
income potential of farms with low quality cows and a $\$ 5.00$ or $\$ 6.00$ milk price. Hence, it takes a great increase in quality of cow to offset an unfavorable milk price. Since an individual farmer can't control the milk price, improving the quality of his cows is his best alternative at low milk prices. At higher milk prices adding more cows becomes more favorable.

## Net Income Isoquants

The income surfaces developed in this study are shown in Figures 9 and 10. The milk response functions for three qualities of cows are compared in each figure. Figure 9 compares the $\$ 6.00$ and $\$ 4.00$ milk prices and figure 10 illustrates the three responses at the $\$ 5.00$ milk price. Each net income isoquant describes combinations of cropland and cows that yield the specified income level. They also indicate the effects of substituting cows for cropland.

In each figure the slope of the isoquant represents an arc estimate of the marginal rate of substitution of cows for crop-


Figure 9. Isoquants for a $\$ 10,000$ net income with low, medium and high quality cows, two prices for milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without hay sales.
land $\frac{(\Delta \text { cropland })}{(\Delta \text { cows })}$.
Each segment of the net income isoquant is a linear approximation of the actual shape of the function. The slope, therefore, is an estimate of the average marginal rate of substitution of cows for cropland over the range of the segment.

As the ratio of cows to cropland increases, the slope of the net income isoquants decrease. For the isoquants where hay sales were prohibited the slope becomes infinite at the point at which hay would normally be sold. This indicates that additional land would contribute nothing to net income. Beyond the highest analyzed ratios of cows to cropland the isoquants, if drawn, would bend away from the axis indicating that additional cows would contribute nothing to net income.

The slope of the net income isoquants show that a cow will substitute for many acres at low ratios of cows to cropland. This relation


Figure 10. Isoquants for a $\$ 10,000$ net income with low, medium and high quality cows, one price for milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without hay sales.
is greatly accentuated in the situations where hay sales are not allowed. As higher cow, cropland ratios are obtained a cow will substitute for fewer and fewer acres of cropland.

Profitable adjustments in numbers of cows and acres of cropland can be found by the following procedure:
(1) Multiply the acres for which a cow will substitute, i.e., the slope of the isoquant by the price of land.
(2) Subtract the price of the cow from the above.
(3) The result will be the net gain for making the substitution. A positive net gain indicates it will pay to substitute cows for cropland. A negative figure indicates it will pay to make an opposite substitution - i.e., substitute cropland for cows.
The milk price and the milk response function exert little influence on the shape of the net income isoquants. The substitutability of cows for cropland - i.e., the slope of the net income isoquants depends mostly on the ratio of these resources.

Two conclusions result from the comparison of net income isoquants for milk responses for different quality cows and milk prices. First, they support the same conclusions as the net income functions. Namely, that it takes a great increase in quality of cow to offset the effects of an unfavorable milk price. Second, the quantities of resources required to produce a $\$ 10,000$ net income increase rapidly with less favorable prices and lower quality cows.

Both the net income functions and the net income isoquants show that considerably greater incomes may be obtained by intensive farms than by extensive farms. The addition of a few cows will greatly increase the net income of extensive farms. Similarly, the net income isoquants show that a single cow will substitute for several acres of cropland at low ratios of cows to cropland and leave income unchanged.

The milk response of different quality cows exerts a considerable influence on both the net income potential and on the resource requirements to obtain a specified net income. It is shown by the net income functions that net incomes may be up to twice as great with high quality cows than with low quality cows. The greater differences occur on intensive farms with high milk prices. From the net income isoquants it can be seen that to produce a $\$ 10,000$ net income, the cropland and cows required are one and one-half to two times as great with the low quality cows than with the high quality cows. The greater resource requirements occur with low milk prices.

Viewed a third way, the anaylsis shows that the income potential of identical resource packages are up to four times as great with the $\$ 6.00$ milk price than with the $\$ 4.00$ milk price. The greater differences occur at high ratios of cows to cropland at the higher milk response function. Similarly, the resource requirements to produce a $\$ 10,000$ net income are up to four times as great with the $\$ 4.00$ milk price than with the $\$ 6.00$ milk price.

## V. Resource Valuation

## Marginal Value Products

In linear programming solutions each limiting resource is assigned "opportunity cost" or "shadow price" equal to its value in its most profitable use. These shadow prices of limited resources are the marginal-value products of the resources, i.e., the change in net income attributable to the last unit of the resource employed. An increase in the supply of one resource relative to a resource for which it can substitute decreases the marginal value of the first resource and increases marginal value of the second resource. In table 7 it can be seen that increasing the cows kept on a fixed acreage rapidly decreases the marginal-value product of cows and rapidly increases the marginal-value product of cropland. The marginal-value product

Table 7. Marginal value products for selected resources with medium quality cows, $\$ 5.00$ price of milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without sales of hay.

| Item | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | . 10 | . 15 | . 20 | . 25 | . 30 | . 35 | . 40 | . 45 | . 50 |


| Cropland (\$/acre) | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 47 | 59 | 89 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 139 | 131 | 122 | 110 | 110 | 106 | 96 | 62 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 20 | 22 | 29 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 37 | 44 | 59 |
| Marginal return <br> over feed costs <br> (\$/cow) | 307 | 303 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 289 | 238 | 211 | 150 |
| Marginal rate of <br> substitution of <br> cows for cropland | -6.3 | -6.5 | -6.2 | -5.6 | -5.6 | -4.5 | -2.1 | -1.1 | 0 |

substitution of
$\begin{array}{llllllll}-6.3 & -6.5 & -6.2 & -5.6 & -5.6 & -4.5 & -2.1 & -1.1\end{array} 0$

Hay sales probibited

| Cropland (\$/acre) | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 17 | 47 | 59 | 90 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dairy cow (\$/cow) | 152 | 152 | 143 | 112 | 112 | 109 | 96 | 62 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy bay (\$/ton) | 5 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 14 | 20 | 22 | 29 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 8 | 8 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 24 | 37 | 44 | 59 |
| Marginal return <br> over feed costs <br> (\$/cow) | 371 | 371 | 343 | 332 | 330 | 303 | 238 | 211 | 150 |
| Marginal rate of <br> substitution of <br> cows for cropland | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | -29.7 | -17.2 | -15.7 | -6.3 | -2.1 | -1.1 | 0 |

of cows assumes that there is a stall available to receive the cow, thus, it represents the annual net return to both the cow and the stall.

The marginal-value product of replacements increases as more cows are added to a fixed acreage, but the range in values products is narrow. Its lower limit is the price for which a replacement may be sold and its upper limit is the purcliase price of a replacement.

The marginal-value product of forage is the opportunity cost of producing a ton of hay equivalent. It increases as the ratio of cows to cropland increases. In other words. a more intensive use of land increases the opportunity costs of producing forage.

The marginal return over feed cost is the shadow price of the cow-feeding process. This quantity is the residual income left above all cash and opportunity costs of producing and feeding forage and grain to the marginal dairy cow. The marginal return over feed costs decreases as more cows are added and results from increased grain feeding as well as increased forage costs. It is important to note that one does not maximize net farm income by maximizing return over feed costs.

## Break-even Prices of Cropland and Cows

The marginal-value products are estimates of the annual net return associated with the marginal unit of each of the resources and intermediate products. In the case of forage and replacements this is their break-even price since they are expended in the 1-year production period. Cropland and cows, on the other hand, provide a flow of services over several production periods. Since this is true, the break-even prices must be calculated by applying proper discounting procedures to the expected return over the life of the resource.

The nature of the resources suggests similar methods of discounting for cropland and cows. Cropland can be considered to yield a perpetual return. Likewise, dairy cows provide a perpetual return because they provide for their own replacements in this analysis.

Both cropland and cows may have an annual tax associated with them. These annual taxes must be subtracted from the marginalvalue products before discounting their future returns.

The break-even prices of land and cows are given by the following formulae.

Break-even price of land $=$ (minus) annual tax on land
Desired rate of return
Marginal-value of product of cows
Break-even price of cows $=$ (minus) annual tax on cows
Desired rate of return

The break-even prices of cows and cropland for the marginalvalue products shown in Table 7 are shown below for the following situation:

Hay sales
Milk price
Milk response
Annual property tax on land
Annual tax on dairy cows
Desired rate of return

Prohibited
$\$ 5.00$ cwt.
Medium
$\$ 4.50$ acre
$\$ 11.00$ head
$1.5 \%$

| Breakeven price <br> for: | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land | .10 | .15 | .20 | .25 | .30 | .35 | .40 | .45 | .50 |  |
| Cows | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 17 | 83 | 283 | 363 | 570 |  |

Because the marginal-value product includes both the cow and the stall, very high break-even prices for cows may be obtained. This also indicates the foregone income of maintaining excess barn capacity. If no stall space is available, the break-even price of cows must cover the cost of providing the stall space as well as the animal.

The desired rate of return is the individual's own preference. A rate of 10 to 20 percent is not excessive, considering the risk involved in dairy farming as opposed to alternative investments.

## The Optimum Ratio of Cows to Cropland

The marginal rates of substitution of cows for cropland recorded in Table 7 and appendix IV were derived from the inverse ratio of the marginal-value products of cropland and cows.*

From these estimates of the marginal rate of substitution of cows for cropland, the optimum ratio of combination of cows and cropland can be determined. Optimum combination of two inputs occurs when their marginal rate of substitution equals the inverse ratio of their

[^7]prices. In this analysis, however, it is necessary to correct the prices of land and cows for annual taxes. This is done in the following procedure. The first step corrects the prices for direct taxes; the second step determines the inverse ration of their prices; and the third step finds their marginal rates of substitution.*
(1) Add the capitalized value of annual taxes on cropland (at the desired rate of return) to the price of cropland. Add the capitalized value annual taxes on cows to the price of cows.
(2) Form a ratio of the corrected price of cows to the corrected price of land.
(3) Compare this ratio with the marginal rates of substitution of cows for cropland in appendix IV. The optimum combination of cows and cropland will be at the place where these quantities are equal.
As an example of the calculation of the optimum ratio of cows to cropland the situation illustrated in table 7 follows:

Assume: Hay sales not allowed
Milk price $=\$ 5.00 /$ cwt .
Milk response $=$ Medium
Price of land $=\$ 100$ acre
Annual taxes on land $=\$ 4.50$ acre
Desired rate of return $=15 \%$
Price of cows $=\$ 450$
Annual taxes on cows $=\$ 11.00$ head
Step 1 (a) $\$ 100+\$ 4.50=\$ 130$ corrected price of land .15
(b) $\$ 450+\frac{\$ 11.00}{.15}=\$ 523$ corrected price of cows

Step 2 Inverse Ratio of Prices $=\frac{\$ 523}{\$ 130}=-4.2$
Step 3 Marginal rates of substitution of cows for cropland at the assumed milk price and milk response: (Table 7)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& .40 \text { ratio }=-2.1 \\
& .35 \text { ratio }=-4.5 \\
& .30 \text { ratio }=-5.6
\end{aligned}
$$

[^8]Therefore, the optimum ratio of cows to cropland under the assumed conditions and prices is between 0.35 cows per acre, and 0.40 cows per crop acre.

Figures 11, 12, and 13 describe the optimum ratios of cows to cropland and different ratios.

To use these figures:

1. Locate present ratio of cows to cropland on vertical axis.
2. Locate price ratio on horizontal axis.
3. Plot a point having the coordinates (price ratio, cow to cropland ratio) found above.
4. Find the line corresponding to the milk price. This line connects all the ratios which would be optimum at this milk price.
5. If the point located in Step 3 is above or to the right of the milk price line it will pay better to add cropland. If below or to the left, it will pay better to add cows.


Figure 11. Optimum ratios of cows to cropland with low quality cows; hay sales at $\$ 27$ per ton and three prices for milk.

These figures indicate:

1. The optimum ratio of cows to cropland is more sensitive to changes in the prices of milk than to differences in milk response of cows.
2. The optimum ratio of cows to cropland is not very sensitive to changes in the cow-cropland ratios at high and medium levels of milk price. It takes a large change in the relative prices of cropland to cows to change the optimum ratio of cows to cropland by 0.05 .
3. Lower milk prices and lower milk response make the optimum ratio of cows to cropland more sensitive to changes in the price ratios.
4. Intensive farms, above 0.30 cows per acre, are optimal under most probable cow and cropland prices when milk prices are $\$ 5.00$ per hundredweight or above. Extensive farms, below 0.30 cows per acre, are optimal only at the $\$ 4.00$ milk price and when land is low priced relative to the price of cows.


Figure 12. Optimum ratios of cows to cropland with medium quality cows; hay sales at $\$ 27$ per ton and three prices for milk.


Figure 13. Optimum ratios of cows to cropland with high quality cows; hay sales at $\$ 27$ per ton and three prices for milk.

## Appraisal of Non-Optimal Milk Production Alternatives

Comparing the shadow prices of non-optimal production alternatives, provides a direct method of comparing alternative qualities of cows as well as levels of grain feeding. Six levels of grain feeding based on three milk response functions as alternatives.

Table 8 compares shadow prices of non-optimal milk production alternatives at the 0.35 ratio of cows to cropland. The basis for comparison is a cow of low milk response. At the $\$ 6$. milk price, this cow would be fed grain at the optimal 3.500 pound level. If this cow were fed 3,000 pounds of grain instead of the optimal level, the result would be a foregone income of $\$ 1$; if 2,500 pounds, the loss would be $\$ 5$. Replacing this low-quality cow with a cow of medium quality fed the optimal grain level would result in a gain in net income of $\$ 81$. Replacing the low-quality cow with a cow of high quality and feeding grain at the optimal level would raise net income by $\$ 119$.

Within both the medium and the high response functions the net change in income associated with changes in level of grain feed-
Table 8. Comparison of optimal and non-optimal milk production alternatives with 35 cows per 100 crop acres, three milk response functions, and three prices of milk.

| Alternative milk response functions | Grain fed per cow |  | Change in net income per cow per 500 lb . increase in grain fed | ```Shadow prices* $5.00 milk``` | Change in net income per cow per 500 lb .increase in grain fed | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Shadow } \\ \text { prices* } \\ \$ 4.00 \\ \text { milk } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Change in net in come per cow per 500 lb .increase in grain fed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4000 | + 95 |  | +70 |  | $+43$ |  |
| High quality cow | 3500 | $+105$ | -10 | + 81 | -11 | +55 | -12 |
|  | 3000 | +111 | $-6$ | + 90 | - 9 | $+66$ | -11 |
|  | 2500 | +115 | $-4$ | + 96 | - 6 | $+75$ | - 9 |
|  | 2000 | $+118$ | $-3$ | $+101$ | - 5 | $+83$ | - 8 |
|  | 1500 | $+119+$ | - 1 | $+105 \div$ | $-4$ | +901 | - 7 |
| Change in net income per cow associated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| response function at optimum grain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| level** |  | $+119$ |  | $+105$ |  | $+90$ |  |
|  | 4000 | + 78 |  | + 56 |  | $+34$ |  |
| Medium quality cow | 3500 | + 78 | $-5$ | + 63 | $-7$ | +43 | $-9$ |
|  | 3000 | + 81\% | - 3 | + 67 | - 4 | $+50$ | $-7$ |
|  | 2500 | + 79 | + 2 | + $69 \%$ | $-2$ | $+55$ | $-5$ |
|  | 2000 | + 74 | +5 $+\quad 5$ | + 67 | $\begin{array}{r} \\ +\quad 2 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | +59 ${ }^{+}$ | - 4 |
|  | 1500 | +65 | $+9$ | +62 | + 5 | $+57$ | $+2$ |
| Change in net income per cow associated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| with a change from low to medium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| response function at optimum grain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| level** |  | + 81 |  | + 69 |  | $+59$ |  |
| Low quality cow | 4000 | - 1 |  | - 5 |  | $-13$ |  |
|  | 3500 | $\ldots$ | $-1$ | - 2 | $-3$ | -7 | $-6$ |
|  | 3000 | $-\quad 1$ | +1 | $\ldots . . . \div$ | - 2 | $-3$ | - 4 |
|  | 2500 | $-\quad 5$ | + 4 | $-\quad 1$ | +11 | $\ldots$ | $-3$ |
|  | 2000 | - 24 | +19 | - 13 | +12 | $-6$ | $+6$ |
|  | 1500 | - 46 | $+22$ | - 29 | +16 | $-15$ | $+9$ |

* The sign of each shadow price has been changed. In this table the shadow price indicates the increase in net income generated by the marginal cow if its milk response function and level of grain feeding were as indicated at the left of the table The difference in net income associated with a change of response function is interpreted as an addition to or subtraction $\dot{f}$ Optimal level of grain feeding.
ing is interpreted the same as with the low response function. A positive value of the change in net income resulting from a 500 pound increase in grain feeding per cow indicates that such an increase will increase net income. A negative value indicates that the change in grain feeding would reduce net income. The optimum level of grain feeding for each milk function is at the point where these signs change from positive to negative.

Comparison of the three milk response functions shows that a cow of high milk production ability can be expected to return annually between $\$ 31$ and $\$ 38$ more than a cow of the medium production ability, and between $\$ 90$ and $\$ 119$ more than a cow of the low production ability if each is fed its optimal level of grain feeding. A cow of medium productive ability will return between $\$ 59$ and $\$ 81$ more than a cow of low productive ability.

## Break-Even Price Differentials Between Cows of Different Production Abilities

The difference in net income resulting from a difference in production per cow can be interpreted as an addition to or subtraction from the annual net return of the dairy cow.

If the quality of the offspring from cows of different milk response functions is not considered, then the excess of the price of a high response cow over a low response cow must be accumulated over the expected herd life of the animal. For a herd life of 4 years the break-even price between cows of different milk responses must be computed by discounting the increased net return over 4 years. The following formula gives the break-even price differential between two cows of different milk response:

$$
V=\frac{R}{i}\left(1-\frac{1}{(1+i)^{n}}\right)
$$

Where $\mathrm{V}=$ the break-even price differential between cows
$\mathrm{R}=$ change in annual net income associated with a change in milk response
$\mathrm{i}=$ desired rate of return
$\mathrm{n}=$ herd life of cow
An example of this computation is as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\wedge \text { ssume: } \quad & \text { Milk price }=\$ 5.00, \text { cwt } \\
& \text { Desired rate of return }=15 \% \\
& \text { Change in net income with cow of high milk } \\
& \text { response }=\$ 36 \\
& \text { Change in net income with cow of low milk } \\
& \text { response }=-\$ 69
\end{array}
$$

Break-even price differentials: For high milk response cows

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{V}=\frac{.36}{.15} \quad\left(1-\frac{1}{(1+.15)^{\prime}}\right) \\
& \mathrm{V}=240 \quad\left(1-\frac{1}{1.749}\right) \\
& \mathrm{V}=240 \quad(0.4283) \\
& \mathrm{V}=\$ 103
\end{aligned}
$$

For low response cows

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{V}=\frac{-69}{15}\left(1-\frac{1}{(1+.15)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \\
& \mathrm{V}=-460(0.4283) \\
& \mathrm{V}=-\$ 197
\end{aligned}
$$

The results of these computations can be interpreted as follows: it pays to buy a cow of the high milk response only if its price is less than $\$ 103$ more than a cow of medium response. Similarly, it pays to buy a cow of medium milk response only if its price is less than $\$ 197$ higher than a cow of low milk response.

## Summary of Resource Valuation

The ratio of cows to cropland strongly influences the value of added units of all resources and intermediate products. This influence is increased by the absence of the alternative to sell hay. The ratio of cows to cropland has a similar influence on the marginal rate of substitution of cropland for cows.

The price of milk has been shown to exert a considerable influence on the marginal return of cows and the marginal return over feed costs. However, it has an almost negligible effect on the marginal return of cropland, forage, and replacements in this model.

The amount of cropland per cow has little effect on the differences in net income due to changes in quality of cows or grain feeding levels. The price of milk has a somewhat greater effect on the differences in net income due to changing quality of cows than to changing grain feeding levels.

## VI. Summary and Conclusions

This study examines the influence of several variables upon farm organization, income, and resources valuation. These variables are:
(1) The ratio of cows to cropland.
(2) The quality of dairy cows.
(3) The presence or absence of the alternative of selling hay.
(4) Price of milk.

Multiple linear programming solutions were used to analyze production and price data typical of New Hampshire dairy farms.

Marginal value products were used to determine break-even prices which may be paid for cropland and cows of varying qualities. Discounting methods were applied to the marginal value products to determine break-even prices of durable assets.

The cropping pattern, the feeding program, and the replacement programs are all highly responsive to changes in the ratio of cows to cropland. The presence or absence of the alternative of selling hay modifies the cropping pattern. Optimum cropping patterns range from very extensive plans to very intensive plans, as the ratio of cows to cropland increases. The profitableness of adjustments in forage and grain feeding depends primarily on the quality of cows and the price of milk. Changes in the ratio of cows to cropland have little effect on the level of grain feeding. The replacement program depends on the intensity of use of resources. In very intensive plans (high ratios of cows to cropland), it pays to buy replacements, thus freeing resources for milk production. In extensive plans or when resources are under utilized, it pays to raise and sell replacements.

The analysis indicates that the income potential of a farm increases greatly as higher milk prices, higher milk responses, and optimal ratios of cropland to cows are attained. Differences in the milk price causes greater differences in income potential than differences in resource combinations. Resource requirements to produce a specified net income increase greatly when farmers receive lower milk prices or have low quality cows. The optimal ratios of cows to cropland appear to occur on fairly intensive farms.

The effect of the quality of the cow is less marked than the effect of milk price. Cows of low quality at a high milk price yield somewhat higher incomes than cows of a high quality at a low milk price. In contrast, the net income potential with high quality cows and a high milk price is more than four times the net income potential with low quality cows and a low milk price.

Within each milk price and milk response combination, the more intensive farms have higher net incomes. Extensive farms are disadvantaged in all price and response combinations, but are more disadvantaged by low milk prices and low milk response.

Changes in the ratio of the price of cows to the price of cropland alter the optimum ratio of cows to cropland; however, at high milk prices, considerable changes in the price ratio would be required to make extensive farms optimal.

The results of this analysis provide guidelines in planning shortand long-run farm adjustments. In the short run the farmer is not able to make large changes in the resources he controls; but he can change the way his present resources are organized. Therefore, in the short run, the optimum organizations and break-even prices are most relevant to his problem. An optimal, short-run plan for a farm can be found by selecting the appropriate ratio of cows to cropland, milk response, and milk price for the farm. The break-even prices for this plan can be calculated by applying the methods developed in this study.

In a longer planning period the farmer has the opportunity to alter the resources he controls quite substantially as well as seek the most advantageous resource combination. Using optimum ratio of cows to cropland can help the farmer develop a long-run plan. The organization and resource valuation information of a long-term plan can suggest the better alternatives and his probable income position after reaching his optimum resource combination.

## APPENDIX I

THE LINEAR PROGRAMMING MODEL

|  |  |  |  |  | Alfalfa | ass - 5y. | ('lover | grass | rofert. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Row |  |  |  |  | HHA | HP1' | PPP |
| Description | Unit | 11) | Ci | 1,evel | low fert. | med. fert. |  |  |  |
| Cj |  |  |  |  | -13.11 | $\because 0.72$ | 5.314 | -3.6.6 | 0.86 |
| Aetivity mmber |  |  |  | $1^{\prime \prime}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {: }}$ |
| Milk silles | 10 ewt | 73 | 50.00 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total eropland | were | 7.1 | . . . . | b. 2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Maximum alfalfa-rorn aeres | acre | 75 |  | b \% | 1.0 | 1.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| Maximum alfalfa acres | acre | 76 |  | b 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| Nasx. now eropland pasture | acre | 77 |  | b) 5 | . . . |  | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| llin. non-ilfalfa reseeding | acre | 78 | -999.00 | ${ }^{1} 18$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| fows on hand | no | 79 | … | b 7 | . . . |  | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| Grerhead cows | no | 80 | 999.00 | 10.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| Stall space | no | -1 | . . . . | b 9 | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| Max. spl. repl. res. | no | $\cdots$ | . . . . | 1010 | . . . |  | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| Repplacement required | 110 | $\therefore 3$ |  | 0.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| Heifer calf control | 110 | 21 | 16.00 | 0.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| silo capistity | 101011 | $\therefore 5$ | . . . . | b13 |  |  | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| . Ilfalfa seeding | art. | 815 | . . . . | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| Clover seeding | irt. | $\times 7$ | . . . . | 0.0 | . . . | . . . | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| ( fover to 3-1-5 yr. grass | 1 rr . | RS |  | 0.0 | . . . | . . . | 3.0 | -3.0 | -3.0 |
| Ii seed elover from 6-12 yr. | art. | $8!9$ | $-999.00$ | 0.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| lieseed alfalfa from 6-12 yr. | :rt. | 90 | $-999.00$ | 0.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| Reseed alfalfa from 6-12 yr. | :rrt. | 91 | $-999.00$ | 0.0 |  |  |  | . . . | . . . |
| 5 yr. ulfalfa to $6 \cdot 12 /$ reseed | art. | 93 | . . . . | 0.0 0.0 | 1.4 | $-1.480$ | - 160 | 1990 | 1.480 |
| Total forame (excl. aftormath) | 1000 TWN | 93 | . . . . | 0.0 | 1.970 | $-2.180$ | - 1.860 | 1.590 | 1.480 |
| Max. May June pasture | 1000 T1) | 9.4 | . . . . | 0.0 | . . . | .... | . . . |  | -0.7:30 |
| Max. fuly August pasture | 1000 THN | 95 | . . . . | 0.0 | -•• | -•. | $\cdots$ | -0.4.50 | -0.450 |
| Max. Sept. Det. paskure | 1000 T1PN | 96 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | -0.300 | -0.300 |
| itiermath colleat | 1000 TON | 97 | . . . . | 0.0 | $-0.450$ | -0.495 | 0.300 |  | . . . |
| Hay enntrol | ton | 98 | . . . | 0.0 | $-1.93$ | -2.14 | -1.28 | -0.80 | . . . |
| (bow feeding control | art. | 99 100 |  | 0.0 | . . . | . . . | ... | . . . | . . . |
| Buy grain | ton | 100 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |
| fach reservation | \$100.00 | 101 | - 6.00 | 0.0 | 0.066 | -0.11.1 | $-0.097$ | -0.018 | -0.009 |
| Latbor - spring | 10 hrs . | $10 \%$ | $\because .50$ | b30 | 0.037 | $0.08 \%$ |  |  | 0.050 |
| Labor - summer | 10 hrs. | 10:3 | 3.50 | b:31 | 0.536 | 0.601 | 0.536 | 0.368 | 0.047 |
| Labor - fall | 10 hrs | 104 | 2.50 | b32 | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |
| Labor - winter | 10 hrs. | 10.5 | 2.50 | b34 |  |  |  |  | . . . |
| Max. hired winter labor | 10 lirs . | 106 |  | b34 |  | . . . | -•• | . . . | . . . |
| Max. corn/new seeding rallio | art. | 107 |  | 0.0 | -••• | -••• | . . . | . . . | . . . |


|  | Clover grass - low fert. |  |  |  | Clover graxs - med. forf. |  |  |  | :3.4-5 yr. prass - zero fort. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | HIIA | 11111I | H1'J | 「1' | IIIIA | 1IJII | 11 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 1'1) | IIIf | H1P1 | PP1 |
| ( ${ }^{1}$ | [-.9x | 15.01 | 11.21 | 8.25 | 20.50 | 23.56 | 18.69 | 15.64 | 5.3 .5 | 3.81 | -0.80 |
| Antivity number | $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{*}$ | 1' | $\mathrm{I}_{6}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{10}$ | $\mathrm{l}_{11}$ | $\mathrm{I}_{1}{ }_{\square}$ | $\mathrm{I}_{1}:$ | $1_{11}$ | $\mathrm{P}^{1}=$ | $\mathrm{F}_{16}$ |
| Milk vales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total cropland | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Maximum alfilfa-eorn aeres | . . . | $\cdots$ |  |  | $\cdots$ | … | … |  | . . . . |  |  |
| Maximum alfalfa acres |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . $\cdot$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nax. noncropland pastare |  |  | . . . . |  | . . . $\cdot$ |  |  |  |  | . . |  |
| Cows on hand |  |  |  | . | . . . |  |  |  |  | . | . |
| Overhead cows |  |  |  |  | $\cdots \cdot$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . | $\cdots$ |
| Stall space | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ |
| Max. spl. repl. res. | $\cdots$ | . . $\cdot$ |  |  | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . |  | $\cdots$ | . . . |
| Replicement required | . . . |  | . . . | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . . |  |  |  |  | . . |
| theifer ealf eontrol |  |  | . . |  |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . |  |
| Silo capacity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\ldots$ | . |
| difilfa seedingr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plover seerling | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 $\because 0$ | 0.5 $\because 0$ | 0.5 $\because 0$ | (1).. 8 |  |  | 2.0 |
| ('lover to $3 \cdot 4.5 \mathrm{yr}$. arass | 3.0 | 8.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | $\therefore .0$ | :3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Rescedl clover from 6-12 yr. | . . . |  | . . . | . . $\cdot$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | - . . | ... |
| Reseed alfalfa from 6-12 yr. |  |  |  |  |  |  | . . . | . . . |  |  |  |
| Reseed alfalfa from 6-1 ${ }^{\text {dr }}$ yr |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | -... | . | $\ldots$ | - |  | ? | -3:3\% | $\because 333$ |
| F yr. alfalfal to 6 -12/rested |  |  |  |  | 1.890 | $\cdots 20$ | $\because .215$ | - 3.060 | 1.350 | 1.480 | -1.265 |
| Total foritee (exel. aftermafli) Misx. May-Jume pasture | 1.715 | 2.15 | 2.010 | -1.863 | 1.n?\% | -...60 | - | $-1.010$ | 1.1 .80 | 1960 | 1.810 0.810 |
| Max. July-Ausnst pasture |  |  | -0.570 | 0.570 |  | . . . | 0.6330 | $-0.630$ | . . . | 0.260 | -0.260 |
| Max. Sept. Oct. pasture |  |  | 0.880 | 0.380 |  |  | 0.420 | 0.120 |  | 0.195 | -0.19. |
| Iftermath colleet | 0.:380 | 000 | -1.01 | . . . | - 0.120 |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  | . . . . |
| Hay eontrol | 1.fi2 | 2.03 | $\cdots 1.01$ |  | - 1.79 | $-2.34$ | -1.12 | . . . | 1.29 | 0.99 | . |
| Cow feeding eontrol | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | .... | -•• | . . . | . . |  | . |  |
| Buy grain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03: | 0.027 | 0.019 | 0.002 |
| Cash reservation Labor - spring | 0.04, $0.0: 8$ | 0.0\% | -0.096 -.038 | - 0.021 | -0.0:\% | $0.0 \% \mathrm{~B}$ | $0.0: 38$ | 0.088 |  |  | 0.050 |
| Liabor - spring Liabor - summer | $0.5: 36$ | $0.5: 26$ | 0.368 | 0.047 | 0.574 | 0.574 | 0.406 | 0.085 | 0.536 | 0.:38 | 0.0 .17 |
| Labor - fall | ... | 0.215 | . . . | . . . | ... | 0.21. | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | -••• |
| Labor -- winter | . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . $\cdot$ | . . . | . . . | .... | . | . |
| Max. hired winter Iitbor |  |  | . . | . . $\cdot$ | -••• | . . . | . . . | -•• | . . . | . . . |  |
| Max. corn new seeding ratio | . |  |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . | . . | . | . . | . |

$3 \cdot 4.5 \mathrm{yr}$. grass - low fert

| Description | IIHA | HIIH | HI'1' | PP1 | HH.t | [111H | HIPI' | 1PP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cj | -12.60 | - 14.54 | -10.99 | 7.82 | -2:3.44 | 25.40 | - 21.5 - | 18.2:3 |  |
| Activity number | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{19}$ | $\Gamma_{20}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{21}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ | 1'\% |  |
| Milk sales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Total cropland | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | \% |
| Maximum alfalfa-corn acres | . . . | . | - | . | . . . | . | . . . | . . . | 3 |
| Maximum alfalfa acres | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . | . . . | 4 |
| Max. non-cropland pasture | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |  | . . . | . . . | 5 |
| Min. non-alfalfa reserding | . | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . |  | . . . |  | 6 |
| Cows on hand |  | . | . | ... | . | . . . | . . . | $\ldots$ | 7 |
| Overhead cows |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | - |
| tall space | . | . | . . . | . | . . . | . . . | . | . | 9 |
| Max. spl. repl. res. |  | . |  | . | . . . | . | . | . | 10 |
| Replacement required | . | . . . | . | . | . . . | . | . . | . | 11 |
| Heifer calf control | . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 12 |
| silo capacity |  | . . . |  | . . . |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | 13 |
| Alfalfa seeding | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 1.1 |
| Clover seeding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| Chover to 3-4-5 yr. grass | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | $\because .0$ | 2.0 | 3.0 | 16 |
| Reseed clover from 6.12 yr. | - | - | . | . | - | . . . | . . . | - | 17 |
| Reseed alfaifa from $6-12 \mathrm{yr}$. | ... | . . . | ... | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 18 |
| Reseed alfalfa from $6-12 \mathrm{yr}$. |  | $\cdots$ |  |  | $\cdots$ |  | $\cdots$ |  | 19 |
| 5 yr . alfalia to $6 \cdot 12 /$ reseed | - $2.38:$ | 2.383 | 2.383 | -2.3\#; | -.3:3 | ? $3: 3$ | 3.3:3 | -3.33: | 20 |
| Total forage (excl. aftermath) | $-1.750$ | --2.065 | - 1.910 | $-1.685$ | - 1.985 | -.345 | $\because .176$ | 1.860 | 21 |
| Max. May-June pasture | . 780 | - | . $\cdot$, | $-1.050$ | - | , | $\cdots$ | -1.195 | $2 \%$ |
| Max. July-August pasture |  | . . . | 0.935 | -0.335 | . . . | . . . | - 01.380 | -0.380 | 2: |
| Max. Sept.-Oct, pasture |  | . . . | -0. $\because 50$ | -0.250 |  | . . . | -0.285 | 0.285 | 24 |
| Iftermath collect | -0.250 |  | -.20 | -0.250 | -0.285 |  |  | - | 25 |
| IIay control | 1.67 | 1.97 | 1.2. | . . . | $-1.91$ | -2.25 | - 1.1. 6 | . . . | 26 |
| Cow feeding control | . . . | . | . . . | . . . | . . . | .... | . . . | . . . | 27 |
| Buy grain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |
| Cash reservatiou | 0.06: | -0.07: | -0.055 | -0.020 | -0.117 | 0.127 | -0.108 | $-0.016$ | 29 |
| Labor - spring | 0.038 | 0.038 | 0.038 | 0.087 | 0.038 | $0.0: 88$ | 0.038 | 0.088 | 30 |
| Labor - summer | 0.536 | 0.536 | 0.368 | 0.047 | 0.601 | 0.601 | 0.406 | 0.085 | : 1 |
| Labor mall | . . . | 0.218 | . . . | . . . | . . . | 0.218 | . . . | . . . | 32 |
| Labor - winter | . . |  | . . | . . . | . | , | . . . | . . . | 33 |
| Max. hired winter labor |  |  |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . | . . . | 34 |
| Max. corn new seeding ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35 |


|  | 6.12 yr grass - zero fert. |  |  |  |  | New seeding |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description C. <br> Activily number | $\begin{gathered} 1[P P \\ 1.70 \\ \mathrm{P}_{23} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PP1' } \\ 2.01 \\ P_{26} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { HHA } \\ 13.36 \\ \mathrm{P}_{27} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { HPP } \\ -11.84 \\ \mathrm{P}_{28} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPP } \\ 8.97 \\ \mathbf{P}_{29} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Alfalfa } \\ \text { from } 5 \mathrm{yr} \\ -49.90 \\ \mathrm{r}_{30} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Alfalfa from $6-12$ 88.22 $P_{31}$ | Clover <br> from $6 \cdot 12$ <br> -42.35 <br> $P_{32}$ | Clover <br> Unrest. <br> -42.35 <br> $\mathrm{P}_{33}$ |  |
| Milk sales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Total cropland | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | $\cdots$ |
| Maximum alfalfa corn acres |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | 2.0 |  |  | 3 |
| Maximum alfalfa acres |  | . . . | $\ldots$ | . . . | ... | 1.0 | 2.0 | . . . . |  | 4 |
| Max. non cropland pasture | .... | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . . | . . . |  | 5 |
| Min. non altalda reseeding | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . $\cdot$ | . . . | . . | . . . |  | . . . | 1.0 | 6 |
| Cows on hand | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 7 |
| Overhead cows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| Stall space | ... | . . . | . . . |  | . . . | . . . |  | . . . |  | 9 |
| Max. spl. repl. res. |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | ... | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 10 |
| Replicement required |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |  | 11 |
| lieifer calf control | . . . |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |  | . . . | . . . | 12 |
| Silo capacity | . . . | $\ldots$ |  | $\ldots$ | . . . |  | 1.3 | . . . | . . . | 13 |
| Alfalfa seeding | . . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  | 14 |
| Clover seeding |  |  |  | . . . | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . . | $-1.0$ | -1.0 | 15 |
| Clover to 3-4-5 yr. grass |  |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |  |  | 16 |
| Fessed clover from 6-12 yr. | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |  |  | 7.0 |  | 17 |
| Resseed alfalfa from $6 \cdot 12 \mathrm{yr}$. |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |  | 18 |
| Ressed alfalia from 6.12 yr . | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | -1.0 |  |  |  |  | 19 |
| 5 yr alialfa to 6-12/reseed | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 20 |
| Total forage (excl aftermath) | 0.920 | 0.790 | 1.170 | 1.280 | -1.093 | 1.:36 | 6.140 | -1.360 | 1.360 | 21 |
| Max. May-June pasture |  | -0.505 | . . . |  | 0.700 |  |  |  |  | 22 |
| Max. Inly-August pasture | 0.640 | 0.163 | . . . | 0.225 | -0.225 | 1.360 | 1.360 | 1.360 | 1.360 | 23 |
| Max. Sept. Oct. pasture | 0.160 | 0.120 |  | 0.170 | 0.170 | ... | . . . | . . . | . . . | 24 |
| Aftermath collect |  | . . . | - 0.170 |  | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . |  | 25 |
| Hay control | 0.6 .4 |  | -1.16 | . . . |  |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | $\because$ |
| fow feeding control |  |  | . . . |  | . . . | . . . | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . . | 27 |
| Buy grain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{28}{98}$ |
| Cash reservation | 0.024 | 0.005 | $-0.067$ | 0.059 | -0.022 | -0.499 | 0.882 | -0.424 | 0.424 | 29 |
| lahor - spring |  | 0.050 | 0.038 | 0.038 | 0.087 | 0.190 | 0.601 | 0.190 | 0.190 | 30 |
| Labor - summer | 0.36: | 0.047 | 0.536 | 0.368 | 0.047 | 0.050 | 0.050 | 0.050 | 0.050 | 31 |
| 1,abor - fall |  |  |  | . . . | . . . | 0.200 | 0.538 | 0.200 | 0.200 | 32 |
| Labor - winter |  |  |  |  |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 33 |
| Max. hired winter labor |  |  | . . | . . . . | . . . |  |  |  |  | 34 |
| Max, corn/new seeding ratio |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | $-2.0$ | 35 |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nlack } \\ & \text { for eq. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rot. } \\ & \text { trams. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rot. } \\ & \text { trinns. } \end{aligned}$ | Corn <br> silage | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non } \\ & \text { crapland } \\ & \text { pasture } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feed } \\ & \text { af.ermath } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { overhe'idl } \\ & \text { cows } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Free } \\ \text { cows } \\ \text { (benchmark) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mescription | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.32 | -6.50 | $-1.50$ | +8.00 | +8.00 |  |
| Aetivify number | $\mathrm{P}_{31}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{31}$ | $\mathrm{I}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\text {g\% }}$ | $1{ }^{3}: 9$ | $\mathrm{P}_{10}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{41}$ |  |
| Milk sale's |  |  | . . . |  | . | . . . | . . . |  | 1 |
| Total eropland | .... | . . . | . . . | 1.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | $\because$ |
| Naximmm alfalfa-corn acres | . . . | . . . |  | 1.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . |  | : |
| Haximum alfalta acres |  | - | . . . | . | . . . | . | . . . | - . | 1 |
| diax. non cropland pasture |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | 1.0 | . | . . . | . . . | F |
| Min. non-allalfa reseeding | 1.0 |  |  |  | . . . | . . . |  |  | 1 |
| Cows on hand | . . . | .... | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 1.0 | 1.0 | 7 |
| Overhead cows | . | - | . . . | . | . . . | . | 1.0 | . | 8 |
| stall space | . | - | . . . | . | . . . | . | 1.0 | 1.0 | 9 |
| Max. spl. repl. res. | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . | . . | 10 |
| lieplacement required | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . | . . . | 0.25 | 0.25 | 11 |
| lleifer ealf conlrol | . | . . | . . . | . . . | . | . . . | - -0.35 | - 0.35 | 1: |
| Silo capatity | . . . | . . . | . . . | 1.3 | . . . | . . . | . . | . | $1: 3$ |
| Alfalfa seeding | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . | . | ... | . . | . . 1 , | 1.1 |
| Clover seeding | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . | . | ... | . | 15 |
| Closer to 3-4-5 yr. Hrass | . . . | . . . |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | - . | 16 |
| Roseed elover from 6-12 yr. |  |  | 7.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . | ... | ... | 17 |
| Reseed alfalta from 6-12 yr. | . | 7.0 |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | ... | 18 |
| $\underline{R}$ serd alfalfat from 6.12 yr . | . . . | 7.0 | 7.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . | 19 |
| 5 yr . alfalfa to $6 \cdot 12 / \mathrm{reseed}$ | . . . | ... | . . . | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  | . . . | . . . | 30 |
| 'Total forage (excl. aftermath) | . . . | . . . | . . . | 4.780 | - 0.720 | 1.00 | $\ldots$ | ... | 21 |
| Max. May-Iune pasture | . . . | . . . | . . . | … | -0.460 | . | . . . | ... | $2 \because$ |
| Max. July-August pasture | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | - 0.150 |  | . . . | ... | $2: 3$ |
| Max. Sep Get. pasture | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 0.110 | $-1.0$ | . . . |  | 2.4 |
| Aftermath colleet | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 1.0 | . . . | - . . | 25 |
| liay control | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | -. . | 26 |
| Cow feeding control | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | ... | $-1.10$ | 1.0 | 27 |
| Buy grain | . . . | . . . | . . . |  |  |  |  |  | 28 |
| ('ash reservation | . . . | . . . | . | -0.192 | -11.005 | 0.015 | 1. K 1 | 1.80 | 29 |
| babor - spring | . | . . . | . . . | 0.411 | 0.050 | , | $2.41 i$ | 1.23 | 30 |
| labor - summer | . . . | . . . | . |  |  |  | 2.18 | 0.99 | 31 |
| labor - fall |  |  | .... | 0.339 | . . | 0.150 | 2.45 | 1.23 | 32 |
| Latbor - winter | $\cdots$ | . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 4.61 | 2.28 | :3 |
| Max. hired winter labor | . | $\cdots$ | . . | $\cdots$ | . . | . . . | . 6 |  | 34 |
| Max. corn/new seeding ratio | . |  |  | 1.0 | . . . | . | . . . |  | :35 |


|  | Nedinm milk response feed grain |  |  |  |  |  | Dry lot freding - summer |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | 1500 | 2000 | 2500 | 3000 | 3500 | 4000 | May-Junt | July-Aug. | Sept-O.t. |  |
| Ci | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -0.15 | 0.49 | $-0.49$ |  |
| Activity number | $\mathrm{r}_{1,}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1: 3}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{45}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{46}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{17}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1 \times}$ | P... | $\mathrm{P}_{\text {su }}$ |  |
| Milk kates | $-9.160$ | 9.615 | 10.000 | 10.320 | 10.575 | -10.780 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 1 |
| Total eropland | . . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | .... | . . . |  |  |  | $\frac{3}{3}$ |
| Manimmm alfalfa-corn acres | . . . |  | . . | ... |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Maximum afalfa arces | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | . | . | . . . | ... | ... | 5 |
| Min, non-alfalfa resedingr | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | ... | $\stackrel{6}{8}$ |
| Cows on hand | . . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | .... | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . . | ... | 7 |
| Owerhead cows | . . . | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | . . . | ... | 8 |
| Liall space |  | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  |  | . | ${ }_{10}^{9}$ |
| Max. spl. repl. res. | . . . | . | . . | . . |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| Replacement required | $\ldots$ | . | $\cdots$ | ... | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | . | . |  | 12 |
| Silo rapacity |  | ... | . . . | . . . | ... | ... | . . . | . . . | . . . | $1: 3$ |
| Alfalfa seeding | . . . | ... | ... | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 1.1 |
| Clower seeding | . . . | ... | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 15 |
| Clover to 3-4-5 yr. grass | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 16 |
| Ressed clover from 6-12 yr. | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . | 17 |
| laseed alfalfa from 6-12 yr | . . . | . . . | . . | . . . | . . . | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | 18 |
| li'stal alfalfa from 6-12 yr. |  | . . . | . . . | . . . . |  |  | . . . |  |  | 19 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 5.055 |  |  |  |  | 21 |
| 'Total forage (exel. aftermath) Mi:x. Alay-June pasture | 5.570 0.720 | 5.455 0.705 | 5.33. | 5.200 0.670 | 5.055 | 4.895 0.630 | 1.0 |  |  | -1 |
| Max. July-August pasture | 0.9615 | 0.9330 | 0.910 | $0.8 \times 5$ | 0.860 | 0.830 | 1. | $-1.0$ |  | 23 |
| Max. Sept.oct. pasture | 0.68 .5 | 0.630 | 0.65.5 | 0.640 | 0.620 | 0.600 | $\cdots$ | . . . | 1.0 | 24 |
| Aftermath collect |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2. |
| Hay control | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.11 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 26 |
| - ow ferding control | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | . . . . | . . . . | . . . . | 27 |
| Buy grain | 11.7 .5 | 1.00 | 1.25 | 1.50 | 1.75 | 2.001 | $\cdots$ | . . . | $\cdots$ | \% |
| Cash resurvation |  | . . . |  | . . . | . . . | . . . |  | . . . | . . | $2!$ |
| lathor - spring | . . . . | . . . | . . . . | . . . . | . . . | . . . | $0.0 \times 9$ | (10) | $\cdots$ | 30 |
| Labor - summer | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 0.093 |  | 31 |
| Labrer - fall | . . . | . . . | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | . . $\cdot$ | 0.094 | 32 |
| labur-winter Max. hired winter labor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 |
| diax. corn;new seeding ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35 |


|  |  | Rep | cements |  |  |  | abor |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deseription ('j | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Bny} \\ & 350.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sell } \\ & +320.00 \end{aligned}$ | Raise spl. res. $-43.00$ | Raise compet. res. $-48.00$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Spriner } \\ 11.50 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Summer } \\ 11.50 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hire } \\ \text { Filll } \\ -11.50 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Winter } \\ & -30.48 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Buy } \\ & \text { grain } \\ & -80.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sell } \\ \text { hay } \\ +27.00 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Aetivity number | $\mathrm{P}_{51}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{52}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{53}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{54}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{55}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{51}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{57}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{55}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{59}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{60}$ |  |
| Milk siales | . . . | . . . |  | . . . | . | . . . | . | . . . | . . . . | . . | 1 |
| Total cropland | . . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . | . . . | . . | . . . | 2 |
| Maximum alfalfa-corn acre | .... | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Max, alfalfa acres | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . | . . . | . . | . . . | 4 |
| Max. noncropland pasture | . . . | . . . | ... | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . | . . . | 5 |
| Min. non-alfillfit reseeding | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 6 |
| Cows on hand | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 7 |
| O) verhead cows | . . . | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . | . . | . . . | . . . |  | 8 |
| Stall space | . . . |  |  | 1.3 | . . . | . . . | . | ... | ... | ... | 9 |
| Max. spl. repl. res. |  |  | 1.0 |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | ... | 10 |
| keplacement required | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | $-1.0$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | ... | ... | 11 |
| Heifer calf control | . . $\cdot$ | . . . | 1.0 | 1.0 | . . . | . . . |  | . . . | ... | . . . | 12 |
| Silo capacity | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 13 |
| Alialfa seeding | . . . | . . . | . . . | . | . | . | . | . . . | . . . | . | 14 |
| Clover seeding |  |  | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 15 |
| Clover to 3-4-5 yr. grass | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 16 |
| Resed clover from 6-12 yr. | -••• | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . | . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . | 17 |
| Reseed alfalfia from 6-12 yr. | . . . | . . . | . . . | . | . . . | . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . | 18 |
| Reseed alfalfa from 6-12 yr. | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |  | 19 |
| 5 yr. alfalfa to $6-12 /$ reseed | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ |  | . . . | . | . . . | . . . | . . . |  | 20 |
| Total forage (excl. aftermath) | . . . | . . . | 3.200 | 5.200 | . . . | . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 1.050 | 21 |
| Max. May -Iune pasture | . . . | . . . | . . . | 0.600 | . . . | . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 2: |
| Max. July-August pasture | . . . | . . . | . . . | 0.800 | . . . |  |  | . . . | . . . |  | 23 |
| Max. Sept.-Oct. pasture | . . . | . . . | . . . | 0.600 | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 24 |
| Aftermath collect | . . . | . . . |  |  |  |  | . . . | . . . |  |  | 25 |
| llay control | . . . | . | 2.0 | 2.0 | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | 1.0 | $\because 6$ |
| Gow feeding eonirol | . . . | . . . |  |  | . . . |  |  |  |  |  | 27 |
| Buy grain | . . . | . . . | 0.60 | 0.60 | . . . | . . . | . . . |  | 1.0 |  | 2 x |
| Canh reservation | . . . | . . . | - 0.43 | - 0.48 |  | . . . | . . . |  | - |  | 39 |
| Sabor - spring | . . . | . . . | 0.60 | 0.60 | -1.0 |  |  | -0.55 |  |  | 30 |
| labor - snmmer |  | . . . | 0.60 | 0.60 | . . . | 1.0 |  | 0.55 |  |  | 31 |
| labor - fall | . | . . . | 0.60 | 0.60 | . . . | . . . | $-1.0$ | -0.55 |  |  | 32 |
| lathor - winter | . |  | 1.2 | 1.2 | . . . | . . . | - | $-1.0$ |  |  | 33 |
| Mitx. hired winter labor |  |  | . |  |  | . |  | $-1.0$ |  |  | 34 |
| Max. forn/new seeding ratio | - | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . | $\ldots$ | . $\cdot$ | . | $\cdots$ | 35 |


|  | Low milk response Feed Grain |  |  |  |  |  | ligh milk response feed grain |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deseription | 1500 | $\underline{2000}$ | 2500 | :3000 | 3500 | 4000 | 1500 | 2000 | $\because 500$ | 3000 | $: 500$ | 1000 |  |
| Cj | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Setivity number | $\mathrm{P}_{81}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{6}$ | $1_{6:}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{61}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{65}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{66}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{6}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{6}$ | $1{ }_{60}$ | $1^{\text {\%1 }}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{81}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\text {\% }}$ |  |
| Milk sales | 7.2:30 | 7.925 | 8.550 | 8.900 | $-9.195$ | -9.4.19 | 10.200 | 10.500 | $-10.775$ | 11.025 | - 11.225 | 11.375 |  |
| Total cropland | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . |  | ... |  |
| Maximum alfalfa corn acre | -. $\cdot$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | ... | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | . . . |  |  |  |
| Maximum alfalfa ateres | . . . | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . | $\ldots$ | . . |  | . |  |
| Max. non-eropland pastur- | $\cdots$ |  | . $\cdot$ | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . | . $\cdot$ | $\cdots$ |  | . . . |  | . |  |
| Cows on hand | . . . | . $\cdot$. | . | . . | . . | . . . . | . | . |  |  |  | . |  |
| Overhead cows | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . | . . | . . | ... |  | . . |  |
| Stall space | . . $\cdot$ | . $\cdot$. | . . . | . . . | $\ldots$ | . . . | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | . | . |  |
| Max. spl. repl. res. | . . . | . . . | . . . | . | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . | . . | . . | 10 |
| lieplicement required | . . . | . . . | . . $\cdot$ | . . . | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . | . . | 11 |
| Heifer calf control | . . . | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . | . . | $\ldots$ | . | . . | 12 |
| Silo capacity | ... | ... | . . . | . . . |  |  |  | . . | . . | $\ldots$ | . | . | 13 |
| Slfalfat serding | . . . | . . . | . . . | .... | . . . | . . . | . . | . . | . . | . . | . | . . | I.4 |
| Clover seeding | . . . | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | . . . | . | . | 15 |
| Clover to 3-4-5 yr. grass | $\cdots$ | . . . | .... | . . . | . . . | . . . |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| Reseed clover from 6-12 yr. | . . . | ... | . . . | ... | $\ldots$ | . . . | . | . . | . . | . . |  |  | 17 |
| lieseed alfalfal from 6.12 yr. | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . | . . | . | . | 18 |
| keseed alfalfa from 6.12 yr . |  |  | . . . | ... | . $\cdot$. | . . . |  | $\cdots$ |  | . . . | $\ldots$ | . . | 19 |
| 5 yr , alfalfa to 6.12/reseed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Total forage (excl aftermath) | 3.285 | 5.235 | 5.180 | 5.000 | 4.805 | 4.570 | 6.060 | 6.000 | 5.938 | 5.875 | 5.805 | 5.725 | 21 |
| Max. May June pasture | . 666 | -659 | .65:3 | . 630 | .605 | . 575 | . 763 | . 756 | .748 | . 740 | . 731 | . 721 | 32 |
| Max. Inly August pasture | - | 889 | .881 | . 850 | .817 | . 777 | 1.0: | 1.02 | 1.009 | . 999 | . 987 | .973 | 23 |
| Max. Sept.Oet pasture | . 6.50 | .644 | . 637 | . 615 | .591 | .56\% | . 746 | .738 | .730 | .723 | . 714 | . 70.4 | 24 |
| Aftermath eollect |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 |
| Hay control | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 26 |
| Cow feeding control | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 26 |
| Buy mrain | 0.75 | 1.00 | 1.25 | 1.50 | 1.75 | 2.00 | 0.75 | 1.0 | 1.25 | 1.50 | 1.75 | 2.00 | 28 |
| Cash reservation | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |  |  | . . | . . . | 29 |
| labor - spring |  |  | . . . | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ |  |  |  | . . | 30 |
| labor - summer | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . . | . . . | . . | . . . | . . | . . . | . | . . | 31 |
| labor - iall | . . . | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |  |  |  |  |  | 32 |
| Lalor - winter | $\cdots$ | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . |  |  |  |  |  | 33 |
| Max. hired winter labor | . . . | . . . | . . . | ... | . . . | . . . | $\ldots$ | . . . | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |  |  | 3 |
| Max. corn/new seeding ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  | . . |  |  |  |  |  | 35 |

## APPENDIX II

PRODUCTION AND PRICE DATA

Appendix table II-1. Crop yields at three levels of fertilization

| Crop | Zero ${ }^{2}$ <br> fertilization | Low? <br> fertilization | Medium² <br> fertilization |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | tons ${ }^{1}$ | tons ${ }^{1}$ | tons ${ }^{1}$ |
| Corn silage <br> fertilization (pounds NPK) | .... | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ 100-75-75 \end{gathered}$ | .... |
| Alfalfa-grass <br> fertilization (pounds NPK) | $\begin{gathered} 2.2 \\ 0-0-0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.7 \\ 0-30-60 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.0 \\ 0-60-120 \end{gathered}$ |
| Clover-grass <br> fertilization (pounds NPK) | $\begin{gathered} 1.8 \\ 0-0-0 \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{2.3}{15-30-30}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.5 \\ 30-60-60 \end{gathered}$ |
| ```3-4-5 year grass fertilization (pounds NPK)``` | $\begin{gathered} 1.7 \\ 0-0-0 \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{2.2}{30-15-15}$ | $\underset{75-37.5-37.5}{2.5}$ |
| 6-12 year grass fertilization (pounds NPK) | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \\ 0-0-0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.5 \\ 30-15-15 \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{1.8}{75-37.5-37.5}$ |
| Clover and alfalfa seedings with oats fertilization (pounds NPK) | $\ldots$ | $\stackrel{2.0}{30-60-60}$ | $\ldots$ |

${ }^{1}$ Expressed as tons of stored forage. Harvesting losses have been deducted.
2 Manure is assumed to be used with each of these levels of fertilization.

Appendix table 11-2. Percentage distribution of forage harvested and percentage total digestible nutrients by species and cut.

| Species <br> and cut | Forage cut as <br> percentage total <br> forage harvested | Percentave <br> TDN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Alfalfa-grass | Percent | Percent |
| 1st cut | 50 | 50 |
| 2nd cut | 27 | 52 |
| 3rd cut | 23 | 59 |
| Clover-grass |  |  |
| 1st cut | 60 | 52 |
| 2nd cut | 30 | 54 |
| 3rd cut | 10 | 54 |
| 3-4-5 year grass |  |  |
| 1st cut | 60 | 50 |
| 2nd cut | 20 | 52 |
| 3rd cut | 10 | 52 |
| 6-12 year grass |  |  |
| 1st cut | 70 | 48 |
| 2nd cut | 20 | 50 |
| 3rd cut | 10 | 50 |
| Oats (pastured) | $\ldots .$. | 55 |
| Corn silage | $\ldots .$. | 19 |

Appendix table II-3. Estimated losses of total digestible nutrients

| Forage | Storage loss ${ }^{1}$ | Feeding loss ${ }^{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Percent |
| Alfalfa-grass hay | 5.2 | 8.0 |
| Clover-grass hay | 5.2 | 8.0 |
| Grass hay | 5.4 | 8.0 |
| Corn silage | 6.0 | 2.0 |

${ }^{1}$ As percent of into storage yield.
${ }^{2}$ As percent of out of storage yield.

Appendix table 11-4. Estimated prices paid and received that were used in the analysis.

| Item | Estimated prices |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Unit | Dollars |
| Prices paid |  |  |
| Farm wage | hour | 1.15 |
| Milk cows (purchased) | each | 350.00 |
| Hay (purchased) | ton | 32.00 |
| $16 \%$ dairy ration | ton | 80.00 |
| Milk substitute | cwt. | 15.60 |
| Fertilizer: |  |  |
| 0-20-20 | ton | 66.00 |
| 5-10-10 | ton | 55.00 |
| 10-10-10 | ton | 66.00 |
| 0-15-30 | ton | 70.00 |
| 15-10-10 | ton | 55.00 |
| $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{NO}_{3}$ | ton | 95.00 |
| Spread lime | ton | 11.50 |
| Seed: |  |  |
| Alfalfa | 1 b . | . 70 |
| Ladino clover | 1 b . | 1.00 |
| Red clover | 1 b . | . 50 |
| Timoth | 1b. | . 25 |
| Bromegras | 11. | . 34 |
| Orchard grass | 1 b . | . 42 |
| Sudan grass | lb. | . 15 |
| Oats | bu. | 1.90 |
| Hybrid | bu. | 10.40 |
| Prices received |  |  |
| Hay (sold) | ton | 27.00 0.00 |
| Cull cows | cwt. | 15.00 |
| Dairy calves | each | 16.00 |
| Milk cows (sold) | each | 320.00 |
|  |  | 6.00 |
| Milk | cwt. | 5.00 4.00 |
|  |  | 4.00 |

## APPENDIX III

OPTIMUM ORGANIZATIONS
Appendix table III－1．Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland，low quality cows，milk price $\$ 4.00$ per hundred pounds，and hay price $\$ 27.00$ ．

| 20.2111 .1 | 20．211H1 | $\underline{20.81511 .1 ~}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| $\frac{2}{2} 511111$ |  |  |
|  | 19.4 PPP | 19．0PP1 |
|  |  | $\cdots$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \therefore 1.6 H 111 \\ 8 . X H H H 1 \end{array}$ | 15.41711 A | 6.1 HHA |
|  | 1 6．2HPP | 12．8119P |
|  | 7．51PP | 9.6 PPP |
| $\cdots$ | ． | －． |
| 1．1．2 |  |  |
|  | 16.7 | 18.0 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 4.2 \\ 10.1 \end{array}$ | 4.3 | 4.2 |
|  | 9.7 | 9.5 |
| 5.7 | ．． | ．． |
| 2.500 | 1.1 | 3.1 |
|  | 2500 | 2500 |
| 22.0 | 32.0 | 35.4 |
| 11.2 | 13.1 | 14.2 |
| 4.2 | 4.2 | 5.3 |
| $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| かく\％ | $77 \times 2$ | －209： |
| 11．7 | 4－2 | 53.7 |
| 432.11 | 78.4 .4 | 977.9 |
| 102 | 10．2 | 112 |
| 201 | 121 | 88 |
| 100 | 79 | 80 |
| 42.6 | 13.9 |  |
| 2391 2 | 2801 | 3026 |
| 4996 | 5151 | 5237 |
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| Item |
| :---: |
| Forage crops and level of fertilization： |
| 5－year alfalfa／low |
| 5－yenr alfalfa／med． |
| 2－y ${ }^{2}$ ar rlover／zero |
| 2－ye：r closer Low |
| $2 \cdot$－eir clover／med． |
| 3－1－5－year grass／zero |
| 3－4．5 year griss／low |
| 3 4－5－year grass／med |
| （i－12－year grass／zero |
| 1；－12 year grass／low |
| ＇orn silage |
| Seed alialfa－oats |
| seed clover－oats |
| Fereding program： |
| Drylot feed May－June，TION |
| Drylot feed July－Aug．．TDN |
| Drylot feed Sept．Oct．TINN |
| Girain fed per eow |
| Lives ock： |
| Dairy cows |
| Replacements raised |
| Replacements sold |
| Replarements bought |
| Heifer calves sold at birth |
| Purchased factors： |
| Annual cash invested |
| Girain bought |
| Hired labor： |
| Jermanent |
| Stpring seasonal |
| Summer seasonal |
| Fall seasonal |
| Product sales： |
| Hay sold |
| Milk sold |
| Income net of variable cosis |

Appendix table III-2. Optimum farm plan with specific ratios of cows to cropland, low quality cows, milk price $\$ 5.00$ per hundred pounds, and hay price $\$ 27.00$.

| ltem | Unit | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  | . 30 | . 35 | . 40 | 45 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | . 10 | . 15 | $\therefore 20$ | . 25 |  |  |  |  |
| Forage crops and level of fertilization: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-yaar alfalfa/low | tere | 20.8 H 11.1 | 1 20.8H11A | 1 20.81111A | 20.8HHA | 20.811 H | 20.81111. |  |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/med. | Arre |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.811 HA | $20.81+11.1$ |
| a vear clover/zero | tere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 - yar clover/low | lere | 24.51711 | - 23.2ННП | ( 22.01717 | $\begin{gathered} 13.6 \mathrm{H} 111 \\ 7.5 \mathrm{PPP} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.3111111 \\ & 17.0 \mathrm{PPP} \end{aligned}$ | 19.5 PPl | 18.splp |  |
| 2-sear clover/med. | Aera |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.61P1) |
| $3 \cdot 4$ - year grass/rero | ler. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-4-5 year grass/low | Iera | 36.811111 | $\begin{array}{r} 1.911114 \\ 29.911111 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.11111 A \\ & \text { f } \\ & \hline 14.011111 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.8 \mathrm{HHA} \\ 9.91 \mathrm{H} 111 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21.511 \mathrm{HA} \\ 9.011 \mathrm{H} 11 \end{array}$ | 17.3H11A $1.911^{\prime} \mathbf{p}^{\prime}$ | 28.2Hpl | $\begin{array}{r} 0.8 \mathrm{H} 111 \\ 27.111 \boldsymbol{P}^{\prime} \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1ppr |  |  |
| $3{ }^{3} 5.5$ yar grass med. | Acre |  |  |  |  |  | . . | ... |  |
| 6-12-year srask/mere | lere |  |  |  | $\cdots$ | . . | . . . |  |  |
| 6.12 year grass/how | lere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Forn silage | lere | 1.4 | 5.4 | 8.9 | 11.9 | 11.0 | 16.5 | 18.7 | 19.2 |
| Sced alfalfa-oats | lere | 4.2 | 4.8 | 1.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 1.2 |
| seed clover-oats | 10\% | 12.3 | 11.1 ; | 11.0 | 11.6 | 10.2 | 9 ¢ | 9.4 | 9.: |
| Feeding program: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| brylot feed duly Aug., TISN | 1000 lb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| brylot feed sept.Oct., 'ron | 1009 1b |  |  |  |  |  | 0.7 | 8.5 | 3.3 |
| Grain fed per cow | [1] | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 30:30 | 3500 |
| lives'ock: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diairy cows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | 40.0 | 11.8 |
| Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 9.6 | 11.4 | 12.8 | 11.2 |
| Replacements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 2.8 | . . |
| Replacements bought | No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heifer calves sold :11 birth | No. | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 3.2 | ¢6. 7 |
| lurchared factors: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annuel casl invested | loullar | 3276 | 4277 | 5269 | 6\%20 | 7160 | R103 | 9171 | $999 \%$ |
| Girain bought | Ton | 16.5 | 25.1 | 3:3.7 | 12.2 | 50.8 | 59.3 | 68.3 | 85.1 |
| Hired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | Hour |  | $\ldots$ |  | 148.4 | 506.2 | 8683 | 1213.7 | 1.4.49.6 |
| Spring reasonal | Howr |  |  | 1.1 | 96 | 102 | 10 S | 120 | 120 |
| Summer seasonal | Howr | 207 | 2.19 | $29:$ | 273 | 201 | 121 | 110 | 105 |
| Fall seasomal | 1lour |  | 47 | 98 | 121 | 102 | 79 | 81 | 83 |
| Product *ales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hay kold | Ton | 140.2 | 119.9 | 97.7 | 71.9 | 45.2 | 16.9 |  |  |
| Milk sold | Ciw. | $890 \quad 1$ | 13351 | 1780 | -225 | 2670 | 3115 | 3568 | 4117 |
| Income nei of variable costs | * | 4.502 | 5392 | 6197 | 15886 | $74 \times 2$ | 806.5 | 852: | -73s |

Appendix table III-3. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland, low quality cows, milk price $\$ 6.00$ per hundred pounds, and hay price $\$ 27.00$.

| Item Unit Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | . 10 | . 15 | $\therefore 0$ | . 25 | . 30 | . 35 | $4{ }^{\circ}$ | . 45 | . 50 | . 55 |
| Forage crops and level of fertilization: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 ycar alfalfa/low | Acre | 20.811HA | - 20.81H1A | A 20.8HHA | A 20.8 HHA | 20.811 HA | 20.8HHA | 20.8HH. |  |  |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/med. | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.sirn. | 20.8 HHIS | 20.8HHA | A 20.8 HHA |
| \%year elover/zero | Acre |  |  | ¢ッ๐ оННН |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2-year clover/low | . cre | 24.711 HH | 23.4HHH | -2.2f1H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15.5HHH } \\ & 5.8 \mathrm{PPP} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.6 \mathrm{HHIH} \\ & 15.0 \mathrm{PPP} \end{aligned}$ | 19.sPPP | 19.3 PPP | 19.0PPP |  |  |
| $3 \cdot y$ ear clover/med. | lere | $\ldots$ | . . | . . |  |  |  |  | 19.0 PP | 18.6PPP | 18.3 HPP |
| 3-4-5-year grass/zero | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-4-5-year grass/low | Acre | 37.0ННН | $\begin{array}{r} 3.5 \mathrm{HHAA} \\ 31.5 \mathrm{HH} \mathrm{I} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { A } & \text { 17.2H1HA } \\ 16.2 H H 1 H \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{A} & 22.0 \mathrm{HHA} \\ \mathrm{I} & 10.0 \mathrm{HHH} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21.7 \mathrm{H} 11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 9.2 \mathrm{H} 11 \mathrm{H} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.61 \mathrm{HA} \\ 1.6 \mathrm{HHH} \end{array}$ | 8.5HHA | 1 2.9HHA | 1.7\%HA |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5HPP | 11.3HPP | 25.6 HPP | 25.3 HPP |  |
| 3 d-5-yenr grass/med. | Acre | ... |  | $\cdots$ |  | $\ldots$ | 6.0 | 9.0PPP |  |  | 27.5 HHA |
| fi-12-year grass/zero | Acre |  | . . | . . |  |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  |  | 27.51HA |
| 6-12-year grass/low | tere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 'orn silage | Aere | 1.1 | 5.0 | 8.8 | 11.0 | 13.3 | 15.6 | 17.2 | 18.1 | 19.1 | 20.0 |
| Seed alfalfa-oats | Aere | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| Sced clover-oats | Acre | 12.3 | 11.7 | 11.1 | 10.7 | 10.3 | 9.9 | 9.1 | 9.5 | 9.3 | 9.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drylot feed May-June, TDN | 1000 lb 1000 lb | 7.0 | 10.5 | 140 | 12.1 | 7.2 | . . |  | 10.8 | 10.0 | 30.5 |
| Drylot feed July-Aug., TDN | 1000 lb | - | . . | . . | . . | . . | . . |  |  |  | 11.6 |
| Drylot feed Sept.-Oct., TDN Grain fed per cow | 1000 lb | 3500 | 3500 | 3500 | 3500 | 500 | (1) | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 11.8 |
| Livestock: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy cows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | 40.0 | 45.0 | 50.0 | 54.1 |
| Replacements ratsed | No. | $\bigcirc .6$ | 4.3 | fi. 1 | 7.9 | 9.6 | 11.4 | 13.2 | 11.7 | 9.0 | 10.0 |
| Replacements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Replacements bought Heifer calves sold at lirth | No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| Purchased factors: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ammal eash invested | Lrollars | 3274 | 4275 | 5266 | 6228 | 717: | 8107 | 9072 | 10013 | 1081s | 11719 |
| Grain bought | Ton | 19.0 | 28.8 | 38.7 | 48.5 | 58.3 | 68.1 | 8.4 .2 | 97.0 | 105.4 | 112.2 |
| Hired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | llour | . . |  |  | 148.4 | 506.2 | 863.91 | 1224.3 1 | 1481.4 | $1696.0 \quad 1$ | 1913.3 |
| Spring seasonal | Howr |  |  | 41 | 94 | 100 | 104 | 109 | 117 | 120 | 131 |
| Summer seasonaI | Hour | 208 | 251 | 296 | 28.4 | 214 | 134 | 84 | 103 | 9.4 | 215 |
| Fall seasonal | Hour | . . . | 49 | 100 | 124 | 105 | 81 | 77 | 79 | 83 | 152 |
| Product sales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| May sold Milk sold | Ton | 141.0 | 121.5 | 99.8 | 75.4 | 49.3 | 21.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Milk sold Income net of variable costs | Cwt. | 919 1 | 1379 1 | 1839 2 | 2299 | 2758 3 | 3218 3 | 3740 | 4248 | 4720 5 | 5011 |
| Income net of variable costs | \$ | .5398 | 6737 | 7995 | 9133 | 10179 | 11223 ) | 12192 | 12940 | 13524 | 13770 |

Appendix table III-4. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland, medium quality cows, milk price $\$ 4.00$ per hundred pounds, and hay price
$\$ 27.00$.

| Item | Unit | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | . 10 | . 15 | . 20 | 25 | . 30 | . 35 | 40) |
| Forage crops and level of fertilization : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/low | Acre | 20.81 H. | $20.8 \mathrm{HH.A}$ | 120.8 HHA | A 20.8HHA | 20.8 Hlld | 20.8H1LA | $120.811 \mathrm{H.1}$ |
| 5-year alfalfa/med. | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 -year clover/zero | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - year clover/low | Acre | 24.8 HHH | 22.9 HHH | I 20.4 HHH | $1{ }^{\text {f }} 9.1 \mathrm{HF1H}$ |  |  |  |
| 2-year clover/med. | Acre |  |  | 1.2 PPP | 11.6 PPP | 19.8PPP | 18.9 PPP | 18.7 PlPP |
| 3-4-5-year grass/zero | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-4-5-year grass/low | Acre | :6.3HHII | 8.2 HHA | 21.6 HHA | A 21.2 HHA | 20.3 HHA | 5.8HHA | 1.81811 A |
|  |  |  | 26.0 HHH | I 10.8 HHH | 9.9 HHH | 5.8 HHH | 12.4HPP | 17.9 HPP |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.6PPP | 10.1 PPP | 8.4PI' |
| 6-12-year grass/zero | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6-12-year grass/low | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn silage | Acre | 3.5 | 6.5 | 10.2 | 12.9 | 15.6 | 18.3 | 18.8 |
| Seed alfalfa-oats | Acre | 4.2 | 1.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| Seed clover-oats | Acre | 12.1 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 10.4 | 9.9 | 9.5 | 9.4 |
| Feeding program: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drylot feed May-June, TDN | 1000 lb | 8.1 | 12.0 | 14.8 | 9.4 | 2.1 |  | 2.7 |
| Drylot feed July-Aug., TDN | 1000 1b |  |  | . . |  |  |  |  |
| Hrylot feed Sept.-Oct., TDN | 1000 lb |  |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.9 |
| Grain fed per cow | 11 | 1500 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 |
| Livestock: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy cows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 85.0 | 36.0 |
| Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 4.8 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 9.6 | 11.4 | 11.7 |
| Replacements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 2.7 |
| Replacements bought | No. | $\cdots$ | 1.7 | $\because$ |  |  | 9 |  |
| Purchased factors: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual cash invested | Dollars | :328 | 4281 | 5268 | 6209 | 7142 | 8095 |  |
| Grain bought | Ton | 2.0 | 17.6 | 23.7 | 29.7 | 35.8 | 41.8 | 43.0 |
| Hired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | Hour |  |  |  | 148.4 | 506.2 | 863.9 | 93.5 .5 |
| Spring seasonal | Hour |  |  | 49 | 101 | 107 | 115 | 118 |
| Summer seasonal Fall seasonal | Hour | 202 | 24.4 | 281 | 247 | 163 | 88 | 83 |
| Fall seasonal | Hour | ... | 42 | 92 | 115 | 92 | 82 | 83 |
| Product sales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hay sold Milk sold | Ton | 137.5 | 116.0 | 91.9 | 63.5 | 34.3 | 5.1 |  |
| Milk sold Income net of variable costs | Cwt. | 916 1 | 442 19 | 1923 2 | 2404 | $\because 884$ | 3365 . 3 | 3460 |
| Income net of variable costs | \$ | 4229 | 4977 | 5635 | 6183 | 6639 | 7047 | 7121 |

mppendix table III-5. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland

| 1 tem | Init | Latio of cows to cropland |  |  |  | .:30 | .35 | ${ }^{10}$ | . 4.5 | . 0 | . 55 | . 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Forage crops and level of fertilization : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/low | . l re | 20.8141818 | 1 20.nHHL | $120 . \mathrm{SHH} 5$ | 20.8 HH .1 | 20.shtid | 1 20.sHH.I | 120.141 .1 | 20.5114 | 120.41111 .1 |  |  |
| --year alfalfa med. | . dere |  |  |  |  |  | -.. |  |  |  | $\because 0.81111$ |  |
| $\because$ year clover/zero | Irre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 -year clover low | . ${ }^{\text {dere }}$ | $24.41 \mathrm{HH14}$ | 120.0111111 | (1) 2 . ${ }^{\text {HHHII }}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.7111111 \\ 9 .: 31^{2} 1^{\prime} 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\mathrm{H} 9.11^{2} \mathrm{PP}}{ }$ | \%98P1 | 1-.6PPP |  | 18.01HP | . . . |  |
| $\because$ year closer/med. | Sere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.2PPl |  | 18.11tPb | 18.141p |
| : - - year grass/zero | Tere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |
| 3-1-5-year grass/low | . Lere | зi.6;11 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 6.1H1HA } \\ 2 \mathrm{x} .11111 \mathrm{t} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.11 H 11 \\ & 11.711 H 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \because 1.611111 \\ 9.8111141 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \because 1.31111 \\ 8.9 H 111 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \because .1 H 11 \\ & \therefore .0 H 1 P \\ & \therefore .6 P^{\prime} P P \end{aligned}$ | 27.9HP1 | , 27.211 PP |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :3 d-5-year grass/med. | Sere |  |  |  | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |  |  |  | 27.0111111 | 127.111111 | 127.111111 |
| (i-12-year grass/zero | Sere |  |  | . . | . . . | . . | . . . | $\cdots$ | . . . |  |  |  |
| 6-12-year grass/low | lere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn silage | Acre | 1.8 | 5.9 | 9.5 | 12.1 | 14.7 | 17.2 | 19.2 | 20.5 | 21.9 | 20.8 | 20.8 |
| Seed alfalfa-oats | lere | 4.2 | 1.3 | I.: | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 4.: |
| Seed clover-oats | Acre | 12.2 | F1.i) | 10.9 | 10.5 | 10.1 | 9.6 | 9.3 | 0.1 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.11 |
| Feeding program: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drylot feed May June, TDN | 100 tb | 7.6 | 11.4 | 15.3 | 10.6 | 5.1 |  | 12.5 | 12.0 | :32.9 |  |  |
| Drylot feed July-Aug. TDN | 100 lb 100 Ib | $\cdots$ | . . | . . | . . | . . |  | 0.8 | 1.5 | 12.9 | 16.: | 17.6 16.0 |
| brylot feed sept.-Oct., TDS firain fed per cow | ${ }_{\text {l1, }}^{100 \mathrm{Ib}}$ |  |  |  |  |  | : 1.7 | 1.0 3000 | :000 | :12.6 | 15.1 4000 | 16.0 1000 |
| firain fed per cow | $\mathrm{ll}_{3}$ | 3000 | :3000 | :3000 | :3000 | :000 | :3000 | :3000 | :3000 | : 771 | 4000 | 1000 |
| Livestock: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy cows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | $: 35.0$ | 10.0 | 45.0 | 50.0 | 55.0 | 56.5 |
| Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 1.3 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 9.6 | 1 I .4 | 11.5 | 8.8 | 9.0 | $\because$ | . . |
| Replacements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 2.9 |  |  |  |
| Replatements bought | No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 | 11.4 | $\begin{array}{r} 14.1 \\ 24.6 \end{array}$ |
| Heifer ealves sold at birth | No. | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 9.7 | 11.0 | 19.7 |  |
| Purchased factors: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $117: 37$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11912 \\ 11: 1.1 \end{array}$ |
| Annual cash invested | Dollars | :1278 | 4278 | $\begin{aligned} & 5371 \\ & 3: 3.7 \end{aligned}$ | 6216 | $715!$ | -098 | 9114 | 9900 | 11124 |  |  |
| Grain bought | 'Ton | 16.5 | 25.1 |  | 42.2 |  | 59.3 | 66.9) | 72.5 | 99.7 | 111.4 |  |
| llired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | Hour |  |  |  | 148.1 | 506.2 | 863:9 1 | 1171.81 | 1:32.7 1 | 1699.61 | 1783.4 | 1804.7 |
| Spring seasonal | Hour |  |  | 47 | 98 | 105 | 111 | 123 | 128 | 137 | 111 | 21:3 |
| Summer seasonat | llour | 205 | 247 | 290 | 26 | Ass | 10680 |  | 10.3 | 220 | 215 |  |
| Fall seasonal | Hour |  | 45 | 95 | 118 | 9 a |  | 84 | 89 | 156 | 160 | 162 |
| Produet sales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hay sold | Ton | 1:99:2 | 118.1 | 95.3 | 68.1 | 40.6 | 11.5 (1.3 |  | 46.4 | 5:343 5 | 59296 | 6091 |
| Milk sold | Cwt. | 1032 1 | 1548 ? | $\because 064$ 25 | 580 | :3096 :3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income net of variable costs | \$ | 621: | 7956 | 9612111 | 153 | 12604 | 14025 | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \because 0 \\ & 15262 \end{aligned}$ | $162: 38$ | 16951 | 17078 | 17107 |

Appendix table III－6．Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland， $\$ 27.00$ ．

| －year alfillfa／low | Sere | 20.85111 .1 | 20.81111 A | 20.81411 .1 | 20.81411 | 20．silH． | 20.81414 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ year alfalfa med． | ． Ac e |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.81111 .1 | 20.81111 | －0．51111． |
| $\because$ year clover／zero | lere | 911711 | －9．9HH11 | －1：31H14 | 10．3HHH |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2 \cdot$ year clover low |  | － | －2．9Rm | $\begin{gathered} -1 . .111011 \\ 0.4 P^{P P P} \end{gathered}$ | $10.5 \mathrm{PPP}$ | 19．9 PP1 | 19．1 P1＇ | 18．5アP1 |  |  |
| 2 －yar clover／med． | lere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | パ：口PrP | 18．91P1 |
| －i－4－5 year grass／zero | lere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ：3－1－5－year grass／low | A．re | ：3；．．）111111 | $1 \underset{7.4 \mathrm{HHA}}{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.9 \mathrm{HH} 11 \\ & \hdashline \mathrm{~F} . \mathrm{7} 11 \mathrm{llit} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.0111111 \\ & 21.21141 \mathrm{~A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.011 \mathrm{HH} \\ 20.711 H 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.4 \mathrm{HPPP} \\ & 8.8 \mathrm{H} 11 . \end{aligned}$ | －1．71p | －1．211 |  |
| ：$/$ f－j－year wrass med | lere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26.811 Pl |
| 6－12－year grass／zero | Sere |  | $\ldots$ | ．． | $\ldots$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| fi－I2－year crass／low |  |  | \％ |  |  |  | 17 | 10.7 |  |  |
| Corn silage | lere | － | 6.8 | 9.9 | 12.5 |  | 14．8 | 19.8 4.2 | －1．3 | $\underline{1.0}$ |
| Seed alfalfa－oats | lere | 4.2 | －1．2 | 1.2 | 4.2 | 10.2 | 4.5 | 9. | 9.1 | 8.9 |
| seed clover otats | Acre | 12.1 | 11.5 | 10.9 | 10.4 | 10.0 |  | 9.2 |  |  |
| Feeding program： <br> brylot feed May－June，TDN | $1000{ }^{13}$ | 7．8 | 11.7 | 15.3 | 9.9 | 1.0 |  | 1：3．0 | 13.0 | 13.1 |
| brylot feed Jaly－Aug．，TDN | 1000 ll |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.0 | 1.5 | 1.9 |
| brylot feed Sept．－Oct．，TDN | 1006 11 |  |  |  |  |  | $\because 4$ | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.3 |
| Grain fed per cow | 11. | 2500 | 2.500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2.500 | $\bigcirc 500$ | 2.500 | $: 000$ | ． 0000 |
| livestock： |  |  |  |  | 25.0 | 30.0 | \％5．0 | 10.0 | 15.0 | 46.6 |
| Dairy cows Replatements raised | No． | 10.0 3.6 | 15.0 4.3 | －6．1 | $\bigcirc$ | 9.18 | 11.4 | 10.7 | －．$\%$ | 9.0 |
| Replacements sold | No． | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | $\because .6$ | 0.7 |  |  |
| Replacements bought | No． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heifer calves sold at birth | No． | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2 | 2.4 | $\because .6$ | －．： | 9.7 | O． 6 |
| Purehased factors： <br> Annual cash invested | Pollars | ： $2 \times 80$ | リンス | 5270 | 6212 | －1：5！ | S096 | 907！ | 9599 | 10：4．6 |
| firaiu bought | Ton | 14.0 | $\because 1.8$ | 28.7 | ：6．0 | 4：3．： | 50.6 | －86．4 | 72．5 |  |
| Hired labor： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | Hour |  |  |  | 1.15 .1 | 10， | 11：3 | 119 | 128 | 131 |
| Spring seasonal Summer seasonal | Hour Hour | 20.4 | $\because 45$ | 49 286 | 251 | $\begin{array}{r}76 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 960 | 110 | 10：； | 10 s |
| Fall seasonal | Hour |  | $4: 3$ | 9.3 | 117 | 96 | 81 | $\therefore 6$ | 89 | 91 |
| Producl sales： | Ton | 1：3．6 | 117.0 | 98.6 | 65.6 | 37.4 | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Mijk sold | Cwt． | $1000 \quad 1$ | 1500 | 2000 | 2500 | ：3006 | $: 500$ | 4000 | 16.1 | 1799 |
| Income net of variable conts | ？ | 5200 | 64：36 | 7583 | －617 | 9560 | 10464 | 11145 | 1159.1 | 11778 |

Appendix table III-7. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland, high quality cows, milk price $\$ 4.00$ per hundred pounds, and hay price
$\$ 27.00$.

| Item | Unit | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  | . 30 | .35 | . 40 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | . 10 | . 15 | . 20 | . 25 |  |  |  |
| Forage crops and level of fertilization: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 -year alfalfa/low | Acre | $20.811 \mathrm{H}$. | $20.811 H A$ | 20.8HHA | A 20.8HHA | $20.8 \mathrm{H} 11 . \mathrm{d}$ |  |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/med. | Acre |  | ... |  | ... |  | 20.8 HH. | 20.83 fli |
| $\because$-year clover/zero | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - year clover/low | Acre | 23.9 Hاप1 | 22.3Hffl | $\begin{gathered} 15.7 \mathrm{HHH} \\ 5.4 \mathrm{PPP} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{r} 3.3 H H F \\ 16.7 P P 戸 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | 19.0P1P | 18.0 PP1 |  |
| 己-year clover/med. | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.7PP1 |
| 3-4-5-year grass/zero | Iere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :3-5 year grass/low | dere |  | 12.811 HA $\because 0.71 \mathrm{H}$ | 21.411 HA |  | $13.0 \mathrm{HH} . \mathrm{A}$ 7.6 HPP |  |  |
|  |  | 35.8 H1411 | $\because 0.711 \mathrm{HH}$ | 10.2 HHH | I 9.211 H 11 | 7.6HPP | 27.111P1 | 26.5 HPP |
| :3-1-5-year grass/med. | lere |  |  |  | . $\cdot$. | . . ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |
| 6-12-year grass/zero | Acre |  | . . | $\ldots$ | . . . | . . |  |  |
| (5-12-year grass/low | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn silage | Acre | 3.5 | 8.0 | 11.8 | 14.9 | 18.0 | $\because 0.9$ | 22.0 |
| Seed alfalfa oats | Acre | 4.2 | 1.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Seed clover-oats | Acre | 11.9 | 11.2 | 10.5 | 10.0 | 9.5 | 9.0 | 8.8 |
| Feeding program: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drylot feed May-June, TDN | 1000 lb | 8.6 | 12.8 | 12.2 | 6.1 | . . | 1:3.4 | 12.6 |
| Drylot feed July-Aug., TDN | 1000 lb |  | . . | . . | . . . |  | 3.0 | 3.4 |
| brylot feed Sept.-Oct., TDN | 1000 lb |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | 5.3 | 5.5 |
| Grain fed per cow | 11 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 |
| Livestock: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy cows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | 38.0 |
| Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 9.6 | 11.3 | 9.5 |
| Replacements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.5 | . . . |
| Replacements bonght | No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heifer calves sold at birtl | No. | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 5.7 |
| Purchased factors: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual cash invested | Dollars | 3288 | 4288 | 5256 | 6193 | 7129 | 8221 | $870 \times$ |
| Grain bought | Ton | 9.0 | 13.8 | 18.7 | 23.5 | 28.3 | 33.0 | 34.2 |
| Hired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | Hour | . . | . . |  | 148.4 | 506.2 | 861.3 | 985.8 |
| Spring seasonal | Hour |  |  | 55 | 107 | 115 | 131 | 135 |
| Summer seasonal | Hour | 197 | 237 | 235 | 213 | 122 | 122 | 120 |
| Fall seasonal | Hour |  | 36 | 85 | 107 | 85 | 92 | 96 |
| Product sales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hay sold | Ton | 135.5 | 111.2 | 83.5 | 53.0 | 21.0 |  |  |
| Milk sold | Cwt. | 1020 1 | 1530 2 | 2040 2 | 2550 | 3060 3 | 3570 3 | 3874 |
| Income net of variable costs | \$ | 4576 5 | $5490 \quad 6$ | 63097 | 7025 | 7624 | 8085 | 8227 |

Appendix table III-8. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland, $\mathbf{\$ 2 7 . 0 0}$.

| Item | Unit | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  | . 40 | . 45 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | . 10 | . 15 | . 20 | . 25 | . 30 | . 35 |  |  |
| Forage crops and level of ferilization : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/low | lere | 20.81 HHA | A 20.8HIIA | A 20.8 HHA | A 20.8 HHA | 20.811 HA | $\therefore 0.811 H A$ | - 20.81111 .1 | 120.8 HHA |
| $5 \cdot y e a r ~ a l l a l f a / m e d$. | Acre | ... |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |
| -year clover/zero | tere |  |  | $\cdots$ | -•• |  |  | ... | ... |
| 2-year clover/low | Acre | 23.7 HHI | I 22.3 HHH | $\begin{gathered} \text { I } 5.7 \mathrm{HHH} \\ 5.4 \mathrm{PPP} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B} \quad 3 \mathrm{HH} \mathrm{H} \\ & 16.7 \mathrm{PPP} \end{aligned}$ | 19.01 llP | 18.01PPP | $\cdots$ | 隹 |
| $2 \cdot y e a r ~ c l o v e r / m e d . ~$ | lere | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  | 16.7PP | 9.01PP | 1 1.01P1 | 17.5PPP | P i7.2PPP |
| 3-4-5-year grass/\%ero | dere | $\cdot$ |  |  |  |  | . . | 17.51P | 17.2P1) |
| 3-4-5-year щrass/Low | . 1 ere | $35.11 \mathrm{IIII}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.8 \mathrm{HHA} \\ & 20.7 \mathrm{H} H \mathrm{I} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.411 \mathrm{HA} \\ & 10.2 \mathrm{HHH} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \mathrm{A} & 20.9 \mathrm{HHA} \\ \mathrm{H} & 9.2 \mathrm{HHHH} \end{array}$ | $13.011 H A$ $7.611 P P$ | $27.1 \mathrm{HPP}^{\prime}$ | 26.2 HPP | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.9PPP | 2.1\%P1 | -6.2HP |  |
| 3 4-5-year grass/med. | tere | $\cdots$ | - | - | $\cdots$ | ,.9P1 | $\cdots$ | . | 25.8HPP |
| 6-12-year grass/zero | Acre | . . | . | . | . . | . . | . | $\cdots$ | -5..ITP |
| $6-12$ year grass/low | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ''orn silage | Acre | 3.5 | 8.0 | 11.6 | 14.9 | 18.0 | 20.9 | 22.6 | 23.5 |
| Seed alfalfa-oats | Acre | 4.2 | 11.2 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| Seed clover-oats | A.re | 11.9 | 11.2 | 10.5 | 10.0 | 9.5 | 9.0 | 8.7 | 8.6 |
| Feeding program: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brylot feed May-June, TDN | 1000 lb | 8.6 | 12.8 | 12.2 | 6.0 | . . | 13.4 | 13.1 | 31.9 |
| Drylot feed July-Aug., TDN | 1000 lb | , | . . | . . | . . |  | 3.0 | 4.2 | 5.2 |
| Wrylot feed Sept. Oct., TDN | 1000 lb | ) 150 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1.4 | 5.3 | 5.9 | 6.4 |
| Grain fed per eow | 11) | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 |
| Livestork: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hairy cows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | - 0.0 | 41.9 |
| Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 7.9 | !.ti | 11.3 | 7.5 | 8.0 |
| Replacements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.5 | $\because$; | 9 |
| Replacements bought Heifer calves sold at birth | No. No. | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.6 8.6 | 2.5 8.8 |
| Purchased factors: <br> $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { Annual cash invested Dollars } 3288 & 4285 & 5256 & 6193 & 8929\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grain bought | Ton | 9.0 | 13.8 | 18.7 | 23.5 | 28.3 | 33.0 | 34.5 | 36.2 |
| Hired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | Hour | . . | . . |  | 148.4 | 506.2 | 861.31 | 1041.511 | 11171.3 |
| Spring seasonal | Hour |  |  | 55 | 107 | 115 | 131 | 138 | 148 |
| Summer seasonal | Hour | 197 | 237 | 253 | 213 | 12: | 122 | 115 | 174 |
| Fall seasonal | Hour |  | 36 | 85 | 107 | 85 | 92 | 99 | 101 |
| Product sales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hay sold | Ton | 135.5 | 111.2 | 83.5 | 53.0 | 21.0 |  |  |  |
| Milk sold | Cwt. | $1020 \quad 1$ | 1530 2 | 20.40 | 2550 | 3069 3 | 3570 | 4080 | 4270 |
| Income net of variable costs | * | 5596 | 7020 | 8349 | 9575 | 10684 | 11655 | 12280 | 12.998 |

Appendix table III-9. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland,
high quality cows, milk price $\$ 6.00$ per hundred pounds, and hay price $\$ 27.00$.

| 1 tem Unit Ratio of rows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | . | . 15 | - | - | . | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |
| Forage crops and level of fertilization: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-gear alfalfa/low | Aere | 20.81114 | 20.811114 | 20.814 H .1 | 20.8H11. | 20.2111 .8 | 20.811 H . | 20.shHild | $\underline{0} 0.21111 .1$ |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/med. | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.81111 |
| 3 weirr cloverzero | lere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2-year clown/low | lere | $2: 3.91111$ | 22.3n711 | $\begin{aligned} & 15.7 \mathrm{H11HH} \\ & 5.4 \mathrm{Pr} 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.3 \mathrm{H} 11 \mathrm{H} \\ & 16.7 \mathrm{PPP} \end{aligned}$ | 19.01PPP | 1s.oppl | 17.51PPP | 17.2P1P | 17.1PPP |
| 2-year clover/med. | Acre |  |  |  |  |  | ... |  |  |  |
| : a $^{1}$ 5-year grass/zero | lere | . |  |  |  |  | 1 | . . . | ... | ... |
| : 15 y year grass/low |  | 35.813111 | $\begin{gathered} 12.811 H A \\ 20.71111 H \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.4 \mathrm{H11.1} \\ & 10.211 \mathrm{III} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.9111111 \\ 9.2111 P \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.01111, \\ 7.611 P 1 \end{gathered}$ | $27.111^{1}$ | $26.211 P 1$ | $\cdots$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.9PPP |  |  |  |  |
| 3 1-j-gear grass/med. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25.711111125 .611111 |  |
| b-12.year grass/zero | Aere | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | . . | - . | $\cdots$ | . . | ... | . . . |
| fille year grass/low | lere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| forn silage | Acre | 3.5 | 8.0 | 11.8 | 14.9 | 18.0 | 20.9 | 20.6 | 23.5 | 23.7 |
| Serd alfalfa-oats | Arre | 1.2 | 11.2 | 10.5 | 14.2 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 8.8 | - 8.2 | 8.6 |
| seed 'lover-0ats | .ere | 11.9 | 11.2 | 10.5 | 10.0 |  | 9.0 | 8.7 | S.6 | - 6 |
| Fecding program: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drylot feed Inly-Aug.. TDN | 1000 lb |  |  |  |  |  | 8.0 | 4.2 | 17.3 | 20.3 |
| Drylot feed sept.Oet.. TDN | 1000 ll |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 5.3 | 5.9 | 15.3 | 17.5 |
| Girain led per cow | 16 | 1500 | 1.500 | 1.500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 2500 | 2500 |
| Livestock: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy cows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.11 | :15.6 | 10.0 | 15.0 | $4 \times .0$ |
| Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 9.18 | 11.3 | 7.5 | 5.2 | - |
| Replacements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | $\because .5$ |  |  |  |
| Replacements bought | No. |  |  |  | 2.2 | 2.1 |  | 2.6 8.6 | 12.8 | 19.: |
| Herifer calves sold :4 hirth | No. | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 8.6 | 12.8 | 19.2 |
| Purchased factors: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grain bought | Ton | 9.0 | 1:3. h | 18.7 | 24.5 | 2s.: | 33.0 | :3.5 | 59.4 | 59.9 |
| llired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Promanent. | Hour | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |  | 148.4 | 500.2 | 861.: | 10.11 .5 | $1272.0 \quad 1$ | 1252.6 |
| Spring seasomal | Hour |  |  | 55 | 107 | 115 | 1:11 | 138 | 151 | 156 |
| Summer seasonal | llour | 197 | 237 | $25: 3$ | 213 | 129 | 123 | 115 | 33 | 226 |
| Fall seasonal | Hour |  | : 6 | 85 | 107 | 85 | 92 | 99 | 167 | 172 |
| Product sales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hay cold llijl sold | Ton | 135.5 | 111.2 | ${ }_{2010} 83.5$ | ${ }^{5550}$ | $\stackrel{21.0}{3060}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Milk sold | Cwt. | 1020 | 1530 2 | 2040 2 | 2550 | 3060 | 33570 | 4080 | 4849 5 | 5160 |
| Income net of variable costs | * | 6614 | 8443 | 10389 | 12125 | $1: 3744$ | 152:5 | 16360 | 16949 | 17007 |

Appendix table III－10．Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland，
low quality cows，milk price $\$ 4.00$ per hundred pounds．

| 110 m | Tuit Ratio of cows to eropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | （\％） | .10 | ． 15 | ． 20 | ． 25 | ． 30 | ． 35 | .40 |
| Forage erops and level of fertilization： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5．year alfalfa／low | Acre |  |  | 1．51117A | ．． | 9.5 HHLA | $20.811 H 4$ | 20.81111 .1 |
| 5－vear alfalfa／med． | Serer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2．year clover／zero | Aler | I2．8PPJ | 17．1PPP | 20.3 PPP | 28.5 PPP | 25.6 PPP | 19.4 PPP |  |
| 2－year elover／how | －－ere |  |  | ．．． |  | ．．． | ．． | 19.0 PPP |
| 3－yerr clover／med． | Sere | $\cdots$ 边 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B－1－5－year grass／zero | Arre | 15．2 4．0PPP | $24.611 P P$ 1.0 PPP | 30.511 Pl | $\begin{gathered} 42.111 \mathrm{PP} \\ 1.7 \mathrm{PPP} \end{gathered}$ | 34．4HPP 4．0РPP | 12．0РPP | ．． |
| ： $3 \cdot 4 \cdot 5 \cdot y \mathrm{car}$ grass／low | lere | ．．． | ．．． | ．． | ．． | ．．． | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8111 .1 \\ & 9.7111 P \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.111111 \\ & 12.2119 P \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1．6P1P | 9.6 PPP |
| 3 f $5 \cdot y$ dir grass／med． | lera |  |  |  |  | －•• | ．．． |  |
| 6－12－year grass／zero | Sere | 9.81 PP | $\because 4.9 \mathrm{PPP}$ | 36．1 PP＇ | 8．4PPP | ．． | ．．． | ．． |
| fi－12．yeitr ırass／low | lere | ．． | ．． | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |
| Gorn silage | Sere | ．． | ．． | 1.2 | 6.0 | 11.7 | I 6.7 | 18.0 |
| Need alfalfa－oats | lere |  | $\cdots$ | 0.3 |  | 1.9 | 4.2 | 1.2 |
| serd clover－oats | ． 10 H | 6.1 | 8．if | 10.2 | 14.3 | 12．\％ | 9.7 | 9.5 |
| leeding program： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wrylot feed Mity－June，TDN | 1001 Jm | $\cdots$ | ．． | ．． | ．． | ．． | ．． | ．． |
| Drylot feed July－Iug．，TDN | 1001117 |  | ．． | ．． | ．． | $\cdots$ |  |  |
| Brylot feed Sept．－Get．．TISN | 100） 11 |  | － |  |  | 3.1 | 3.8 | 3.1 |
| Grain fed per cow | ［1］ | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 |
| Hives ork： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| bairy cows | So． | 10.0 | 13．6 | 18.4 | 2：3．2 | ㅂ․0 0 | ？2．s | 35.4 |
| Replacements raised | No． | 2.7 | 5.1 | 7.3 | 9.3 | 11.2 | 1：3．1 | 1.1 .8 |
| Replacements sold | No． | 0.1 | 2.0 | 2． | 8.5 | 1.2 | 4.9 | 5.3 |
| Replaterments bought | No． |  | ．． | ．． | ．． | ．． | ．． |  |
| Ileifer calves sold at birth | No． | 1.5 | ．． |  | ．． | ．． | ．． | ．． |
| Jarrlased factors： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anmual casli invested | Wollars | 2ご4 | 8115 | 4201 | 5403 | 16．5－1： | 71990 | －293 |
| Girain bousht | Tom | 14.0 | 20.9 | $\because 7.3$ | 34.5 | 11.7 | 48．8 | 52.7 |
| Hired labor： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | 11001 | ．． | ．． | ．．． | 82.2 | 433 | 784．4 | 977.9 |
| Spring seasonal | 110 m |  |  |  | 49 | 70 | 99 | 112 |
| Summer seasonal | Howr | ． | ．． | 21 | 91 | 97 | 0.5 | AS |
| Fall stasonal | 110\％ | ．． |  | ．． | 27 | 54 | 77 | 80 |
| Productsales： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milk sales | Cwt． | $\therefore 51$ | 1159 | 1569 | 1980 | $2: 391$ | 2801 | 3026 |
| Income net of variable rosts | \＄ | 1800 | 2x20 | 3785 | 438.4 | 4763 | 5101 | 5237 |

Appendix table III-11. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland, low quality cows, milk price $\$ 5.00$ per hundred pounds.

| Hem | Unit |  | Ratio of ro | ws 10 cropl |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fem | Unit | . 10 | . 15 | . 20 | 25 | . 30 | . 35 | . 40 | . 45 | . 50 |
| Forage crops and level of fertilization: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/low | Acre | . . | . . | 1.01IHA |  | 9.8 HHIA | 20.8 HH A |  |  |  |
| $5 \cdot$ year alfalfa/med. | tere |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.8114 A | 120.811 H .1 | 120.8114 A |
| 3 year clover/zero | Aere | 12.8PP1 | 17.41'P' | $20.31{ }^{1} 1$ | $29.91{ }^{1} \mathrm{P}$ | 25.3 PPP | 19.7 PPP |  |  |  |
| 2 year clover/low | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.8PPP |  |  |
| 2-year clover/ined. | Aerc Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.6PPP | 18.6PP1 |
| 3.1-5-year grass/zero | Acre | $\begin{gathered} 15.311 \mathrm{Pl}^{\prime} \\ 4.0 \mathrm{PPP} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2: 3.9 \mathrm{HP}{ }^{\prime} \\ 2.2 \mathrm{PPP}^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ | 30.4 H1P | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41.1 } \mathrm{HPP} \\ & 3.8 \mathrm{PPP} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 33.111Pl } \\ & \text { 4.8PPP } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.6 \mathrm{HPP} \\ 13.6 \mathrm{PPP} \end{gathered}$ | , |  |  |
| 3-4-5 year grass low | Acre | . . . | . . . |  | . . | . | 15.511PP | , 28.2l1PP | , 27.111PP | $26.3 \mathrm{HPP}^{1}$ |
| 3.f.5-year grass/med. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 HHA | 1.6H11A |
| i-12-year grass/zero | Acre | 9. ${ }^{\text {apPP }}$ | 25.9 PrP | 36.0 PPP | 4.3PPP | . . | . | . . | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| (i.12-year grass/low | lere |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |
| Corn silage | Acre | . . . | . | 1.9 | 6.0 | 12.4 | 15.9 | 18.7 | 19.2 | 19.3 |
| Seed alfalfa oats | Aere |  |  | 0.2 |  | 2.0 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| seed elover-oats | Aere | 6.4 | 8.7 | 10.1 | 15.0 | 12.6 | 9.9 | 9.4 | 9.8 | 9.3 |
| Feeding program: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tirylot feed May-lune, TDN | 100 lb | . . | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | . . | 11.1 | 10.2 | 10.0 |
| Drylot feed July Aug., TDN | 100 lb | . . . |  | . . | . . . |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hrylot feed Sept.-Oet., TION | 100 lb |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.0 |
| Girain fed per cow | $1 b$ | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 2500 | 3000 | 3030 | 3500 | 3500 |
| livestock: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wairy cows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | 40.0 | 44.6 | 15.2 |
| Replacemen1s raised Replacements sold | No. | 9 | 4.8 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 9.4 | 11.4 | 12.8 | 11.2 | 11.3 |
| Replacements sold Replacements bought | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 2.8 | . . |  |
| Heifer ealves sold at birth | No. | $1 . \%$ | 1.7 | 1.9 | 8.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | $3 \ddot{2}$ | 6.7 | 18.8 |
| Purchased factors: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual eash invested | bollars | 2226 | 3328 | 4.411 | 51593 | 6849 | 7992 | 9171 | 9987 | 10066 |
| Girain bought | Ton | 14.0 | 21.8 | 28.6 | 36.0 | 43.3 | 59.3 | (i8.:3 | 85.1 | 85.9 |
| lired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | Hour | . . | . . | . . . | 1.48 .4 | 606.2 | \$63.9 | 1213.7 | 1449.6 | 1478.7 |
| Spring seasonal Summer sasonal | Hour Hour | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ |  | 51 | 7.4 | 96 | 120 | 120 | 120 |
| Fill sea somal | Hour |  | $\ldots$ | 28 | 84 29 | 89 57 | 73 73 | 110 81 | 105 83 | 105 83 |
| Product sales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milk sales | Cwt | 855 | 1283 | 1710 | 2137 | 2565 | 3115 | 3567 | 4117 | 5156 |
| lncome net of variable costs | \$ | 2655 | 4107 | 5486 | 6441 | 7238 | 8000 | 8523 | 8738 | 8830 |

Appendix table III-12. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland, low quality cows, milk price $\$ 6.00$ per hundred pounds.

| Item | Unit | - Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  | . 30 | . 35 | .40 | .45 | . 50 | . 5.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | . 10 | . 15 | . 20 | . 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Forace erops and level of fertilization : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.year alfalfa/low | Aere |  | . . | 0.9 HHA | . . | 5.3 HHA | 20.8 HILA | 20.81411 .1 |  |  |  |
| 5 -year alfalfa/med. | Acre |  | 170 | $\therefore$ ¢PPP |  |  |  |  | 20.8 HHL | 20.81412. | $\because 0.814 \mathrm{Ha}$ |
| $\because \cdot$ year clover/zero | Acre | 12.5 PPP | 17.0PPP | 20.5 PPP | 27.4PPP | 27.9 PPP | 20.0 PPP | 19. |  | . . | . . |
| 2 -year clover/low | Acre |  | . . | . . . |  | . . . | . . . | 19.:3PP1 | 19.0РPP |  |  |
| 2-year clover/med. | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.6 PPP | 18.3 PPP |
| :3-4-5-year grass/zero | dere | 15.2 HPP 8.6 PPP | 23.9 HPP 1.6 PPP | 30.7 HPP | 41.1HPP | $\begin{gathered} 41.1 \mathrm{HPP} \\ 0.7 \mathrm{PPP} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.0 \mathrm{HPP} \\ & 12.1 \mathrm{PPP} \end{aligned}$ | . $\cdot$ | . . | -• | - |
| 3-4-5-year grass/low | dere | 硣 | 1.6 PP1 | . . . | . . | . . | 7.0HPP | 11.3 HPP | 25.6 HPP | 26.3 HPP |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.511 HA | $2.9 \mathrm{HH}$. | 1.7 HHA | . . |
| $3 \cdot 4-5$-year grass/med. | - cere | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | - | ... | . $\cdot$ | $\cdots$ | 27.511111 |
| 6-12-year grass/zero | dere | 8.9PPP | 24.5PPP | \%0.6PPP | 11.9PPP | . . | . . | $\cdots$ | . . | $\cdots$ | -7... |
| 6-12-year grass/low | lere | . . | ... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn silage | Acre | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 10.0 | 5.9 | 0.1 | 14.9 | 17.2 | 18.1 | 19.1 | 20.0 |
| Seed alfalfa-oats | - ${ }^{\text {dere }}$ | 6.3 | 8. | 0 |  | 1.1 | 10.2 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | -1.2 |
| Seed clover-oats | Aere | 6.8 | 8.5 | 10.2 | 13.7 | 13.9 | 10.1 | 9.6 | 9.5 | 9.3) | 9.2 |
| Feeding program: Tir |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drylot feed May-June, TDN | 10011 | . . | . . | $\cdots$ | . . | , . | . . | $\cdots$ | 10.8 | 10.0 | :30.5 |
| Drylot feed July-Aug., TDN | 100 ll | . . | . . | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  | $\because 9$ |  | 11.6 |
| Drylot feed Sept.Oet., TDN | 100 lb | $0 \cdot$ | 3000 | 3000 | 3018 | 1.6 3500 | 2.3 3500 | 8.7 | 2.9 1000 | 3.0 1000 | 11.8 |
| Grain fed per cow | lb | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3018 | 3500 | 3500 | 38 I 4 | 1000 | 4000 | 4000 |
| Livestock: 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy eows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | $\because 5.0$ | 30.0 | 35.0 | 40.0 | 45.0 | 50.0 | 54.1 |
| Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 9.6 | 11.4 | 13.3 | 11.7 | 9.0 | 10.0 |
| Replacements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1. F | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 0.5 | $\cdots$ |  |
| Replacements bought | No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 11.0 | 11.2 |
| Heifer ealves sold at birth | No. | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 6.3 | 11.0 | 11.2 |
| Purehased factors: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annmal cash invested | Dollars | $\because 219$ | 3318 | 14.6 | 5640 | 6795 | 7952 | 9072 | 10013 | 10818 | 11719 |
| Grain hought | Ton | 16.5 | $\because 5.1$ | 33.1 | 42.4 | 58.3 | 68.1 | 84.2 | 97.0 | 105.4 | 112.2 |
| Hired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | Hour | . . |  | . . | 148.4 | 506.2 | 863.9 | 1224.3 | 1481.4 | $1696.0 \quad 1$ | 1913.3 |
| Spring seasonal | Hour | . . | . . | $\therefore \cdots$ | 49 | 62 | 89 | 109 | 117 | 120 | 131 |
| Summer seasonal | Hour | . . . | . . | $\because 8$ | 84 | 94 | 79 | 84 | $10: 3$ | 94 | 215 |
| Fall stasonal | Hour |  |  |  | 25 | 46 | 69 | 77 | 79 | 83 | $15 \because$ |
| Produet sales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milk sitles | Cwt. | 890 | 1:335 | 1780 | $\because 237$ | $\because 759$ | 3218 | 3740 | 4348 | 4720 | 5011 |
| Income net of variable costs | \$ | 3528 | 5417 | 7249 | 8658 | 9903 | 11130 | 12192 | 12940 | $1: 3524$ | 1:7770 |

Appendix table III-13. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland, medium quality cows, milk price $\$ 4.00$ per hundred pounds.

| Item | Unit | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio of } \\ & .10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { cows to ar } \\ .15 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { opland } \\ .20 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\because 5$ | . 30 | . 35 | 40 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Forage erops and level of fertilization : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-ycar alfalfa/low | Aere |  |  | 0.61414 |  | 15.11114 | 20.81111 | 20.211H. |
| 5 -year alfalfa/med. | Acre Acre | 13.4 PPP | 18.2PPP | $20.8 \mathrm{PP1}$ | $30.61{ }^{\text {PPI }}$ | 22.4 PPP |  |  |
| - year clover/zero | lire | 1.3 .4 PP | 18.-PPP | -0.8PP1 | .0.61P1 | -2.4PP | 7.5PPP | 17.7PPP |
| 3 year clover/med. | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-4-5-year grass/zero | tere | $\begin{gathered} 15.2 \mathrm{HPP}^{\prime} \\ 1.8 P^{\prime} \mathrm{PPP}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2: .9 \mathrm{HPP}^{\prime} \\ 3.5 \mathrm{PPP} \end{gathered}$ | 31.214 Pl | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1.4HPP } \\ & 3.6 \mathrm{PPP} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \because 3.711 P^{\prime} \\ & 9.9 Р Р 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 3-4-5-year crass/low | lare |  | ... | . . . | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.81111 \\ & 1.1 .5 H 11 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{17.911 \mathrm{PP}}^{1.8141}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $12.11{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ | 8.11 PPP |
| :3-5-year grass/med. | tere |  |  |  |  |  | . . |  |
| 6-12-year grass/zero | tere | $11.8 P P P$ | 2x.iPPP | :3.0РPP | . | $\cdots$ |  |  |
| Corn silage | Acre |  |  | 3.8 | 8.1 | 14.8 | 18.3 | 18.8 |
| Seed alfalfa-oats | tare |  |  | 0.1 |  | 3.0 | 4.2 | 1.2 |
| Seed clover-oats | Aere | 6.7 | 9.1 | 10.4 | 15.3 | 11.2 | 9.5 | 9.4 |
| Feeding program: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drylot feed May-tune, TDN | 100 lb |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.7 |
| Drylot feed July-Aug., TDN Orylot feed Sept.Oet., TDN | 100 lb |  |  |  | 1.3 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| Grain fed per cow | 11. | 1.300 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 2000 | 2000 |
| Livestock: |  | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | 36.0 |
| Dairy cows Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 4.3 | -6.1 | -7.9 | 9.6 | 11.4 | 11.7 |
| Replacements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 2.7 |
| Replacements bought | No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heifer calves sold at birth Purehased factors: | No. | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 2.7 |
| Purehased factors: Annual cash invested | Dollars | $23: 39$ | 3.48 | 1481 | 5749 | 6906 | 8061 | 8296 |
| Grain bought | 'Ton | 9.2 | $13 . \mathrm{K}$ | 18.7 | 23.5 | 28.3 | 41.8 | 43.0 |
| Hired labor: Permanent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent Spring seasonal | Hour Hour |  | $\ldots$ |  | 148.4 58 | 506.2 86 | 868.9 112 | 935.5 |
| Summer seasonal | Hour |  |  | 27 | 87 | 84 | 75 | $8: 3$ |
| Fall seasonal | lour |  |  |  | 38 | 68 | 82 | 8.3 |
| Product sales: Milk sales | Cwt. | 916 | 1374 | 1832 | 2290 | 2748 | 3365 | 3460 |
| Income net of sariable eosts | \$ | $\because 126$ | 3763 | 4991 | 5796 | 6461 | 7030 | 7121 |

Appendix table III-14. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland, medium quality cows, milk price $\$ 5.00$ per hundred pounds.

Appendix table III-15. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland, medium quality cows, milk price $\mathbf{\$ 6 . 0 0}$ per hundred pounds.

| Item | Unit | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  | . 30 | . 35 | 40 | 45 | . 50 | 55 | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | . 10 | . 15 | .20 | . 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Forage crops and level of fertilization: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - year alfalfa/low | lere |  |  | 1.1HH. |  | 10.5 HH1. | 20.84114 | 20.8HHA | 20.8HHA | $\underline{20.811 H A}$ | -0.81HA | $\underline{20.8 H H A}$ |
| 5.year alfalfa/med. | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 -year clover/zero | Aree | 13.0PPP | 17.1 19P' | $20 .: 3 P P P$ | 30.2 PPP | 25.0PPP | 19.3 PPP |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 -year clover/low | Acre |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.6PPP | $\cdots$ | 18.011PP | 18.1HP1 | 18.1HPP |
|  | tere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.2 PPP |  |  |  |
| 3-4-5-year grass/zero | lure | $\begin{aligned} & 15.2 H P P \\ & 4.3 \mathrm{PPP} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23.9HPl' } \\ & 2.7 \mathrm{PPl}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | :0.41PP | $\begin{aligned} & 41.1 \mathrm{HPP} \\ & 4.2 \mathrm{PPP} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 . \mathrm{AHPP} \\ & 5.7 \mathrm{PPP} \end{aligned}$ | 6.8PP1 | $\cdots$ |  | ... | ... |  |
| 3-4-5-year grass/low | tere |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0HHA | $27.9{ }^{\text {2 }}{ }^{\text {P }}$ | 27.311PP |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.4HPP | . . |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.8PPP |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 1-5.year grass/med. | lere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27.0 HHH | 27.1HHH | 1 27.1HHH |
| 6.12-year grass/zero 6.12 year grass/low | Aere | 10.6 PPP | 27.1PPP | 35.9 PPP | $3.81{ }^{1} \mathrm{P}$ | $\ldots$ |  | . $\cdot$ | . . |  | . . |  |
| (\%-12-year grass/low Corn silage | Acre |  |  | 2.0 | 6.0 | 12.5 | 17.2 | 19.2 | 20.5 | 21.0 | 20.8 | 20.5 |
| Seed alfalfa-oats | Acre |  |  | 0.2 |  | 2.1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 1. | 4.2 |
| Seed clover-oats | dree | 6.5 | 8.9 | 10.1 | 15.1 | 12.5 | 9.6 | 9.3 | 9.1 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Feeding program: TDY 100 lle 310.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drylot feed May-Iune, TDN | 100 lb |  |  |  |  |  | . | 12.5 0.8 | 12.0 | 32.0 12.9 | 3.4 .7 16.3 | 34.6 17.6 |
| Drylot feed July-Aug., TDN | 100 ll |  |  | . . | ... | 2.5 | 3.6 | 0.8 4.0 | 1.5 4.3 | 12.9 12.6 | 16.8 | 17.6 16.0 |
| Gritin fed per cow | 11. | 2500 | 2500 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | :3000 | $: 3000$ | 3000 | 3771 | 4000 | 4000 |
| Lives'ock: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy cows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | 40.0 | 45.0 | 50.0 | 55.0 | 56.6 |
| Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 9.6 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 2.3 | . . |
| Replacements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 1.5 | $\underline{2.9}$ |  |  |  |
| Replacements bought | No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 | 11.4 | 14.1 |
| Heifer calves sold at birth | No. | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.4 | $\because 6$ | 4.5 | 0.7 | 11.0 | 19.7 | 22.6 |
| Purchased factors: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual eash invested | bollars | 23:31 | 3336 | 4443 | 5699 | ${ }^{685} 5$ | 5028 |  | 9900 | 11124 | 11737 | 11912 |
| Grain bought | Ton | 14.0 | 21.3 | 33.6 | 12.2 | 50.8 | 59.3 | 66.9 | 72.5 | 99.7 | 111.4 | 113.1 |
| Hired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | Hour | . . | . . | . . | 148.4 | 506.2 | 863.9 1 | 1171.3 | 1372.7 | $1696.0 \quad 1$ | 1783.51 | 1804.7 |
| Spring seasonal | Hour |  |  |  | 51 | 65 | 104 | 123 | 128 | 137 | 141 | 143 |
| Summer seasonal | Hour | . . | . . | 29 | 84 | 88 | 76 | 110 | 103 | 220 | $\because 15$ | 213 |
| Fall seasonal | Hour |  |  |  | 29 | 57 | 79 | 84 | 89 | 156 | 160 | 162 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ineome net of variable eosts | 8 | 4474 | 6684 | 8916 | 10727 | 12382 | 13985 | 15262 | 16238 | 16951 | 17078 | 17107 |

Appendix table III-16. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland,
high quality cows, milk price $\$ 4.00$ per hundred pounds. high quality cows, milk price $\$ 4.00$ per hundred pounds.

| Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1tem | Unit | . 111 | 15 | . 20 | . 25 | . 30 | . 35 | 40 |
| Forage crops and level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/low | Acre |  |  |  | 0.2 HHA | 20.6HHA |  |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/med. | tree |  |  |  |  |  | 20.81411 A | 20.81115 .1 |
| $\because$ year clover/zero | Acre | 14.1PPP | 19.3 PPP | $21.9 \mathrm{PP1}$ | 29.4PPPI | 19.1 PPP |  |  |
| -year clover/low | lere |  |  |  |  |  | 18.0 PPP |  |
| 2- year clover/med. | Acre | $15.21 \mathrm{PPP}^{\prime}$ | 23.9 HPP | 39.911 P |  |  |  | 17.7P1P |
|  |  | 5.9 PPP | 5.1 PPP |  | 4 | 14.5 PPP |  |  |
| 3-4.5 year grass/low | Sers |  | . . . |  | . . . |  | $27.111 P P$ | 26.511 PP |
| 3 - 5 - yoar grass/med. | tere |  |  |  |  | . . |  |  |
| ti-12-year grass/zero | Arre | 14.4 PPP | :32.6PPP | 2x.3PPP | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  |
| ti-12-year grass/low | Icre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn silage | Sere | . | . | 6.0 | 11.6 0.1 | 18.0 4.1 | 20.9 4.2 | 22.0 |
| Seded clover-oats | sere | 7.1 | 9.7 | 10.9 | 14.7 | 9.6 | 9.0 | 8.8 |
| Fereding program: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drylot feed May-June. TDN | 100111 |  |  | . . | $\ldots$ |  | 13.4 | 12.6 |
| Drylot feed July-Aug., TDN | 100 ll |  |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.4 |
| Inylot feed Sepit.-Oct., TDN frain feit per cow | 100 lb |  |  | 0.4 1500 | 3.4 | 4.6 1500 | 5.3 1500 | 5.5 |
| frain fedi per cow liwestock: | 1 b | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 |
| Livestock: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inairy cows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | 38.0 |
| Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 9.6 | 11.3 | 9.5 |
| Replacements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.5 |  |
| Replacements bought Heifer calves sold at bipth | No. No. | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | $3 \ddot{2}$ | 2.4 | $\because$ | 5.7 |
| Purchased factors: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual cash invested | boliars | 2256 | 3375 | 4537 | 579.4 | 6975 | ฬ221 | $\checkmark 708$ |
| Grain bought | Ton | 9.0 | 13.8 | 18.fi | 23.5 | 28.3 | 33.0 | 34.2 |
| Hired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | Ilour |  |  |  | 148.4 | 506.2 | 861.3 | 985 - |
| Spring seasonal | Hour | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | 8 | 68 | 100 | 131 | 135 |
| Summer seasonal | Ifour |  |  | 28 | 92 | 79 | 122 | 120 |
| Fall serasonal | Hour |  |  |  | 51 | 83 | 92 | 96 |
| Product sales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milk sales | Cwt. | 1020 | 1530 | 2040 | 2550 | :3060 | 3570 | 387.1 |
| Ineome net of variable costs | * | 2819 | 4353 | 5720 | 6687 | 7527 | so85 | 8227 |

Appendix table III-17. Optimum farm plan with specified ratios of cows to cropland,

| $1 t e m$ Unit latio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1em | Unit | 110 | 15 | . 20 | . 25 | . 30 | . 3.5 | 10 | . 45 |
| Forage crops and level of fertilization : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/low | Aere |  |  |  | 0.21 HA | 20.6H11A |  |  |  |
| 5 - year alfalfa/med. | Arre |  |  |  |  |  | 20.8 HHL | 120.81111 .4 | 20.sHH |
| 2-year elover /zern | tree | 14.11P1 | 19.311P1 | 21.9 PPP | 29.4PPP | 19.1P1P |  |  |  |
| a-jear clover/low | Sera |  |  |  | . . |  | 18.01P1' |  |  |
| 2-year clover/med. | lere | 15.2 HPP | 23.911 PP | 32.911 PP | 14.111PP | 14.91 PP |  | 17.5PP' | 17.2111P |
|  |  | 5.9 PPP | 5.1 PPP |  |  | 1.5.5P1 |  |  |  |
| 3-4.5-year grass/low | lere | $\ldots$. | ... | . . | . . | . . | 27.111P | 26.2HP1 |  |
| 3-4-5-year grass/med. | lere |  |  |  | $\ldots$ |  | ... | ... | 25.8HP1 |
| ti-12-year grass/zero | lere | 14.4P1' | 32.61 PPP | 2R.3PP1 | . . |  |  | . . |  |
| 6.12-year grass/low Corn silace | lere | . | . $\cdot$. | 6.6 | 11.5 | 18.0 | 20.9 | 22.6 | 23.5 |
| Seed alfalfa-oats | lere |  |  |  | 0.1 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| Seed clover-oats | Arre | 7.1 | 9.7 | 10.9 | 14.7 | 9.6 | 9.0 | 8.7 | -8.6 |
| Fepting proyram: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drylot feed May-dunc. TIPN | 10016 | . . | $\ldots$ | . . | . . | . . | 1:3.1 | 13.1 | 31.0 |
| Drylot feed July-Aug., TDN | 10011 | . . | . . |  | - |  | 3.0 | 4.2 | 5.2 |
| brylot feed Sept.oct.. TDN | 100 lb |  |  | 0.4 | 3.4 | $4 . t$ | 5.3 | 5.9 | 6.1 |
| Grain ted per cow | 11. | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 |
| Livestock: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy fows | No. | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | 10.0 | 41.9 |
| Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 9.6 | 11.3 | 7.5 | $\therefore 0$ |
| Replatements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.5 |  |  |
| Replacements bought | No. |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.15 | 2.5 |
| Heifer calves sold at lialm | No. | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 8. 6 | 8.8 |
| Purrhased factors: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual cash invested | Wolar | 2256 | 3373 | 45:37 | 5794 | 16975 | 2221 | 2979 | 9571 |
| Grain bought | Ton | 9.0 | 13.* | 18.6 | 23.5 | 28.3 | 33.01 | 3.4 .5 | 36.2 |
| Hired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | llour |  | . . |  | 148.4 | 506.2 | 861.: | 1041.0 | 1171.8 |
| Spring seasonal | Hour | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\alpha$ | 69 | 101 | 131 | 138 | 14.3 |
| Summer seasonal | tlour | . . | ... | 28 | 92 | 79 | 122 | 115 | 174 |
| Fall stasonal | llour |  |  |  | 51 | 8; | 12 | 99 | 101 |
| Product sales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milk vales | Cwt. | 1620 | 1530 | 2040 | 2550 | 3060 | 3570 | 4080 | 4270 |
| lucome net of variable conts | * | 3839 | 5882 | 7.760 | 9237 | 10587 | 11655 | 12286 | 1249 A |


| Item Unit Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  | . 30 | .35 | . 40 | . 45 | . 50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | . 10 | . 15 | . 20 | . 25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Forage erops and level of fertilization: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-year alfalfa/low | Aere |  |  |  | 0.2 HHA | 20.61HH. | 20.SHHA $20.81 / 11$. |  | 20.81111. | 20.81111 .1 |
| 5-year alfalfa/med. | Aere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S-year clover/zero - year clover/low | Arra | 14.1P1P | 19.3 PPP | 21.9PPP | 29.4 PPP | 19.1 PPP |  | 20.81/1 | ... |  |
| 2-year clover/low a-year clover/med. | Sere Sera |  |  |  | . . |  | 18.0 PPP | 17.5 PPP | 17.2ppp | 17.1PPP |
| 3-1-5-year grass/zero | A.re | 15.2111 P | 23.9НPP | 32.911 PP | 44.1 HPP | 14.2HHP | $\cdots$$27.111 P P$ |  |  | $\cdots$ |
|  |  | 5.9PPP | 5.1 PPP |  |  | 1.4.5PPP |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-t-5-year grass/low | lere |  |  |  |  | . . |  | 26.2111 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  |  |
| 3-4-5-year grass/med. | . l -re |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25.71114 | 25.611111 |
| 6. I2-year grass/zero $6 \cdot 12$ year grass/low | A1r lere der | 14.4PP' | 32.6 PPP | 2R.:3PP1 | . | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  |  |
| ('orn silage | lere | $\cdots$ | . . . | 6.0 | 11.5 | 18.0 | 20.9 | 22.6 | 23.5 | 23.7 |
| Seed alfalf:-oats | Acre |  |  |  | 0.1 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| Soed clover-oats | A're' | 7.1 | 9.7 | 10.9 | 14.7 | 9.6 | 90 | 8.2 | 8.6 | 8.6 |
| Fueding program: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dryiot feed May June, TDN | 10011 |  | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |  | 13.4 | 13.1 | 33.7 | 35.8 |
| brylot feed July-Aug.. TDN | 1001 lb |  | . . |  |  |  | 2.18 | 4.2 | 17.3 | 20.3 |
| Drylot feed Sept.Oct. TIDN | 100 ll |  |  | 0.4 | 3.4 | 4.6 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 15.3 | 17.5 |
| Grain fed per cow | 11. | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1.500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 2500 | 2500 |
| Lives ock: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy cows | N0 | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | 40.0 | . 5.0 | 47.9 |
| Replacements raised | No. | 2.6 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 9.6 | 11.: | 7.5 | 5.2 | . . |
| R"placements sold | No. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2, |  |  |
| Ineifer calves sold at hirth | No. | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 8.6 | 12.8 | 19.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anmual cash invested | 1bollar: | 2256 | :3373 | $45: 37$ | 5794 | 6975 | 8221 | 8979 | 1006 s | 10:364 |
| Grain bought | Ton | 9.1 | 13.8 | 18.6 | 23.5 | 28.3 | 33.0 | 34.5 | 59.4 | 59.9 |
| lired labor: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent | Honr | $\ldots$ |  |  | 148.4 | 506. 2 | 861.3 | $1041.5 \quad 1$ | 1272.0 1 | 1282.6 |
| Spring seasonal | Hour |  | . . | $\rightarrow$ | 68 | 101 | 131 | 138 | 151 | 154 |
| Summer seasonal | Hour | $\cdots$ | . . | 28 | 92 | 79 | 122 | 115 | 228 | 226 |
| Fall scisonal | Hour |  |  |  | 51 | 83 | 92 | 99 | 167 | 172 |
| Product vales: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milk sales | Cwt. | 1020 | 1530 | 2040 | 2550 | 3060 | 3576 | 4050 | 4849 | 5160 |
| Income net of variable costs | \$ | 485! | 7413 | 9800 | 11787 | 13647 | 1522.5 | 16369 | 16949 | 17007 |

## APPENDIX IV <br> SELECTED MARGINAL VALUE PRODUCTS

Appendix table IV 1. Marginal value products for selected resources with low quality cows, $\$ 4.00$ price of milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without sales of hay.

| Item | Ratio of cows to eropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | . 10 | . 15 | .20 | .25 | . 30 | . 35 | 40 |
| Hay sales at \$27.00 per ton |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cropland (\$/acre) | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 28 |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 36 | 24 | 18 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$ each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | $: 20$ | 320 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1.5 | 16 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 27 | 27 | 97 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 30 |
| Marginal return over feed costs (\$/cow) | 151 | 148 | 145 | 145 | 145 | 1.3.t | 125 |
| Marginal rate of substitution of cows for cropland | $-1.6$ | 1.2 | 0.92 | 0.47 | $-0.47$ | -0.18 | 0 |

Hay sales prohibited

| Cropland (\$/acre) | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 16 | 28 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 67 | 65 | 47 | 25 | 25 | 13 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 |
| Buy hay (*iton) | \% | 5 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 1:3 | 16 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 8 | 8 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 23 | 30 |
| Marginal return over feed costs (\$/cow) | $\because 14$ | 214 | 186 | 176 | 174 | $15 \%$ | 125 |
| Marginal rate of substitution of cows for cropland | . | . - | 9.9 | $-3.9$ | $-3.4$ | 0.83 | 0 |

## Appendix table IV 2. Marginal value products for selected resources with low quality cows, $\$ 5.00$ price of milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without sales of hay.

| Item | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | . 10 | 15 | . 20 | . 25 | . 30 | . 35 | .40 | .45 |
|  | Ratio sales at 827.00 per ton |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cropland (\$/acre) | 22 | 20 | 20 | $\because 0$ | 20 | 21 | 46 | 58 |
| Dairy cow (\$ head) | 69 | 61 | $5:$ | 41 | 11 | $: 88$ | 31 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | $: 320$ | 320 | 320 | 850 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 13 | 1:; | 14 | 1.1 | 14 | 15 | 20 | ご |
| Sell hay (\$ ton) | $\because 7$ | 27 | 27 | $\because 7$ | 27 | $\because 7$ | 38 | 4.5 |
| Marginal return over feed costs (\$/cow) | 237 | $2: 31$ | 231 | $2: 31$ | -31 | 220 | 174 | 150 |
| Marginal rate of substitution of cows for eropland | -3.2 | -3.1 | $-2.7$ | $-2.1$ | $-2.1$ | $-1.6$ | -0.68 | 0 |

May sitles prohibited

| Cropland (\$ acre) | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 50 | 58 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hairy cow (\$/luead) | St | so | $7 \because$ | 12 | 43 | 41 | 31 | 0 |
| Replicement (\$/each) | :300 | $: 20$ | 300 | $3: 0$ | $: 30$ | 320 | 320 | 8.50 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 5 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 12 | $\because 0$ | 22 |
| sell hay (\$1,ton) | n | i | 16 | $1 i^{\prime}$ | 16 | $\because 0$ | 38 | 15 |
| Marginal return over feed costs (\$/cow) | 299 | $\because 94$ | $\because 3$ | 261 | $\because 59$ | 218 | 174 | 150 |
| Marginal rate of substitution of cows for cropland | . . | -• | 1.50 | $-4.4$ | $-6.8$ | --3.6 | 0.68 | 0 |

## Appendix table IV 3. Marginal value products for selected resources with low quality cows, $\$ 6.00$ price of milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without sales of hay.

| Item | Ratio of cows to croplend |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 | . 15 | . 20 | . 25 | . 30 | . 35 | 40 | 45 | . 50 | . 55 |
|  | Hay sales at 82.2 .00 per tou |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cropland ( ${ }^{\text {acre }}$ ) | 22 | 211 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 34 | 45 | 58 | 110 |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 159 | 151 | 14.3 | 131 | 131 | 130 | 126 | 125 | 93 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 220 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 13 | 1:3 | 1.1 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 17 | 20 | 22 | :3 |
| Sell hay (\$ ton) | 27 | 27 | 27 | $\because 7$ | $\because 7$ | $\because 7$ | 3: | 3 s | 45 | 70 |
| Marginal return over feed costs (\$/cow) | 327 | :323 | 321 | 321 | 321 | 318 | 289 | 267 | 243 | 150 |
| Marginal rate of substitution of cows for cropland | -7.3 | $-7.5$ | - 7.3 | --6.6 | -6.6 | $-6.2$ | $-3.7$ | -2.8 | -1.6 | 0 |

Hay sales prohibited

| Cropland (\$/acre) | 0 | U | 5 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 34 | 45 | 58 | 110 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dairy cows (\$/head) | 168 | 16s | 160 | 131 | 130 | 130 | 126 | 125 | 93 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 5 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 17 | 20 | 22 | 33 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 8 | $\sim$ | 14 | 16 | 16 | $\bigcirc 0$ | 32 | :8 | 45 | 70 |
| Marginal return over feed costs (: $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{cow}$ ) | 387 | 387 | 360 | :360 | 318 | 337 | 289 | 267 | $\because 4: 3$ | 150 |
| Margimal rate of substitution of cows for cropland | . . |  | 33.3 | 20.9 | -18.3 | -11.6 | $-3.7$ | 2.8 | -1.6 | 0 |

## Appendix table IV 4. Marginal value products for selected resources with

 medium quality cows. $\$ 4.00$ price of milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without sales of hay.| Item | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | .10 | .15 | .20 | .25 | .30 | .35 | .40 |


|  | Hay sales at $\$ 27.00$ per ton |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cropland ( $\$ /$ acre) | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 35 |
| Dairy cow ( $\$ /$ head) | 42 | 33 | 25 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 4 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 |
| Buy hay ( $\$ /$ ton) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Hay sales prohibited

| Cropland (\$/acre) | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 17 | 35 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dairy cows (\$/head) | 57 | 57 | 39 | 16 | 16 | 11 | 4 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 |
| Buy hay (\$ tou) | 5 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 14 | 17 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | $n$ | 2 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 24 | 33 |
| Marginal returu <br> over feed costs <br> (\$/cows) | 276 | 276 | 243 | 235 | 234 | 206 | 166 |
| Marginal rates of <br> substitution of <br> cows for cropland | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | -7.6 | 2.4 | -2.2 | -0.66 | -0.11 |

Appendix table IV 5. Marginal value products for selected resources with medium quality cows, $\$ 5.00$ price of milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without sales of hay.

| Item | Ratio of cows to eropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | . 10 | . 15 | . 20 | . 25 | . 30 | . 35 | . 40 | . 45 | . 50 |


| Cropland (\$/acre) | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 47 | 59 | 89 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 139 | 131 | 122 | 110 | 110 | 106 | 96 | 62 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 20 | 22 | 29 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 37 | 44 | 59 |
| Marginal return <br> over feed costs <br> (\$/cow) | 307 | 303 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 289 | 238 | 211 | 150 |
| Marginal rate of <br> substitution of | -6.3 | -6.5 | 6.2 | -5.6 | -5.6 | -4.5 | -2.1 | -1.1 | 0 |

substitution of
cows for cropland

Hay sales prohibited

| Cropland (\$/acre) | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 17 | 47 | 59 | 90 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 152 | 152 | 143 | 112 | 112 | 109 | 96 | 62 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 5 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 14 | 20 | 22 | 29 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 8 | 8 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 24 | 37 | 44 | 59 |
| Marginal return <br> over feed costs <br> (\$/cow) | 371 | 371 | 343 | 332 | 330 | 303 | 238 | 211 | 150 |
| Marginal rate of <br> substitution of <br> cows for cropland | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | -29.7 | -17.2 | -15.7 | -6.3 | -2.1 | -1.1 | 0 |

Appendix table IV 6. Marginal value products for selected resources with medium quality cows, $\$ 6.00$ price of milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without sales of hay.

| Item | Ratio of cows to eropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | .10 | . 15 | .20 | . 25 | . 30 | . 35 | .40 | .45 | . 50 | . 55 | . 60 |
|  | May sales at $\$ 27.00$ per ton |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cropland (\$/acre) | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 47 | 19 | 107 | 135 | 145 |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | $\bigcirc 40$ | 232 | 224 | 212 | 212 | 200 | 199 | 165 | 70 | 19 | 0 |
| Replacement (*/each) | 329 | 320 | 320 | 820 | 8.30 | 320 | 220 | $: 350$ | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 13 | 18 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 20 | 29 | 32 | 38 | 40 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 27 | 27 | 27 | $\stackrel{3}{ }$ | $\because 7$ | $\because 7$ | 87 | 44 | 68 | 82 | 87 |
| Marginal return over feed costs (\$/cow) | 408 | 105 | 402 | 402 | 402 | 891 | 2.41 | 315 | 220 | 169 | 150 |
| Marginal rate of substitution of cows for cropland | 11.0 | 11.6 | 11.4 | -10.7 | 10.7 | -R.R | $-4.3$ | 2.8 | 0.65 | -0.11 | 0 |

Ilay sales prohibited

| Cropland (\$/acre) | 11 | 11 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 16 | 47 | 59 | 107 | 135 | 145 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 252 | 252 | 243 | 213 | 213 | 211 | 199 | 165 | 70 | 10 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | $3: 0$ | 320 | 320 | 320 | $\because 20$ | 320 | 320 | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 5 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 18 | $\because 0$ | 20 | 32 | 38 | 40 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | R | * | $1{ }^{6}$ | 16 | 16 | 23 | 37 | 41 | 6 R | 82 | 87 |
| Marginal return over feed costs (\$/cow) | 471 | 471 | 443 | 433 | 431 | 10.8 | 311 | : 15 | 200 | 169 | 150 |
| ```Marginal rate of substitution of cows for cropland``` |  |  | $-50.7$ | 32.8 | $\because 9.8$ | 13.4 | - 4.3 | -こ.3 | -0.65 | $-0.14$ | 0 |

Appendix table IV 7. Marginal value products for selected resources with high quality cows, $\$ 4.00$ price of milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without sales of hay.

| Item | Ratio of cows to cropliznd |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | .10 | .15 | .20 | .25 | .30 | .35 | .40 |


| Cropland (\$/acre) | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 17 | 35 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 76 | 67 | 59 | 46 | 41 | 25 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 220 | 320 | 340 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 13 | $1: 3$ | 14 | 14 | 15 | $\simeq 0$ | 21 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 27 | $\bigcirc 7$ | 27 | 27 | 27 | 37 | 11 |
| Marginal returu over feed costs (\$/cow) | 244 | 240 | 236 | 2314 | 293 | 1137 | 147 |
| Marginal rate of substitution of cows for cropland | -3.5 | -3.4 | $-3.0$ | -2.2 | --1.7 | 0.5:3 | 11 |

Hay sales prohibited

| Cropland (\$/acre) | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 47 | 55 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 97 | 97 | 73 | 51 | 51 | 25 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 340 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 5 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 20 | 21 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 0 | 8 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 37 | 41 |
| Marginal return <br> over feed costs <br> (\$/cow) | 315 | 315 | $271 ;$ | 270 | 269 | 167 | 147 |
| Marginal rate of <br> substitution of <br> cows for cropland | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | -12.1 | -7.5 | 7.2 | -0.53 | 0 |

Appendix table IV 8. Marginal value products for selected resources with high quality cows, $\$ 5.00$ price of milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without sales of hay.

| Item | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | .10 | .20 | .25 | .30 | .35 | .40 | .45 |


| Cropland (\$/acre) | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 47 | 59 | 97 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 178 | 169 | 161 | 148 | 143 | 127 | 89 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 13 | $1: 3$ | 14 | 14 | 15 | 20 | 22 | 30 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 37 | 44 | 64 |
| Marginal return <br> over feed costs <br> (\$/cow) <br> Marginal rate of <br> substitution of <br> cows for cropland | 346 | 342 | 338 | 338 | 325 | 269 | 239 | 150 |

## Hay sales prohibited

| Cropland (\$/acre) | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 47 | 59 | 97 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 199 | 199 | 175 | 153 | 153 | 127 | 89 | 0 |
| Replacements (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 5 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 20 | 22 | 30 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 8 | 8 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 37 | 44 | 64 |
| Marginal return <br> over feed costs <br> (\$/cow) | 417 | 417 | 378 | 372 | 371 | 269 | 239 | 150 |
| Marginal rate of <br> sulstitution of <br> cows for cropland | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | -29.8 | -22.3 | -21.4 | -2.7 | -1.5 | 0 |

Appendix table IV 9. Marginal value products for selected resources with high quality cows, $\$ 6.00$ price of milk, various ratios of cows to cropland and with and without sales of hay.

| Item | Ratio of cows to cropland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | .10 | .15 | .20 | .25 | .30 | .35 | .40 | .45 | .50 |

Hay sales at $\$ 27.00$ per ton

| Cropland (\$/acre) | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 47 | 59 | 134 | 144 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 280 | 271 | 260 | 250 | 245 | 229 | 191 | 20 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy hay ( $\$ /$ ton) | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 20 | 22 | 38 | 40 |
| Sell hay (4/ton) | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 37 | 44 | 82 | 86 |
| Marginal return <br> over feed costs <br> $(\$ / c o w)$ | 448 | 444 | 440 | 440 | 427 | 371 | 341 | 170 | 150 |
| Marginal rate of <br> substitution of <br> cows for cropland | -12.8 | $\mathbf{- 1 3 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 3 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 2 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 0 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{- 4 . 7}$ | -3.2 | -0.15 | 0 |

Hay sales prohibited

| Cropland (\$/acre) | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 47 | 59 | 135 | 144 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dairy cow (\$/head) | 300 | 300 | 277 | 255 | 255 | 229 | 191 | 20 | 0 |
| Replacement (\$/each) | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Buy hay (\$/ton) | 5 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 20 | 22 | 38 | 40 |
| Sell hay (\$/ton) | 8 | 8 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 37 | 44 | 82 | 86 |
| Marginal return <br> over feed costs <br> ( $\$ / c o w)$ | 519 | 519 | 480 | 474 | 473 | 371 | 341 | 170 | 150 |
| Marginal rate of <br> substitution of <br> cows for cropland | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | -47.4 | -37.1 | -35.7 | -4.9 | -3.2 | -0.15 | 0 |


[^0]:    * Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland Agricultural Experiment Stations participated in this regional project.

[^1]:    *Agricultural Economist, Farm Production Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U. S. Depaitment of Agriculture stationed at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., and Associate Professor, Dept. of Res. Econ., Univ. of N. H., Durham, N. H., respectively.

[^2]:    * The study areas used in this analysis were designated for use in the Northeast Dairy Adjustment and Supply Response Study.

[^3]:    * See appendix I for the linear programming model.

[^4]:    * Dailey, R. T., Frick, G. E., and McAlexander, R. H., editors, "Agricultural Economic Planning Data for the Northeastern United States," A.E. \& R.S. 51, Pennsylvania State Univ., Univ. Park, Pa., July 1965.
    **See appendix II for yield and price data used in this study.

[^5]:    * Expressed as annual requirements and production. Forage requirements were seasonally distributed in the linear programming model.
    $\%$ Source: E. R. Rutter, "Estimates of New Hampshire Pasture Production," unpublished M. S. Thesis, University of New Hampshire, 1961.
    $\dagger$ Dairy Adjustment Research Committee, based on Jensen, E. et. al.: InputOutput Relationships in Milk Production, USDA Tech. Bul. 815, 1942.
    + Unpublished data, Northeast Dairy Adjustments Research Committee, based on U. S. Census of Agriculture data.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Maximum and minimum percentages found in solutions at each ratio.

[^7]:    

    The last expression on the right of the equality is the defining formula for the marginal rate of substitution of cows for cropland. The customary notation for this formula involves partial derivatives. However, in linear programming, derivative notation and the delta notation are equivalent.

[^8]:    *The problem is to find R , the gross annual return necessary to pay the direct taxes and provide the desired rate of return on the purchase price of the asset.
    $\mathrm{iP}=\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{T}$
    where: $\quad \mathrm{R}=$ gross annual return
    $\mathrm{T}=$ annual direct tax
    $\mathrm{P}=$ purchase price
    $\mathrm{i}=$ desired rate of return
    this formula transposes to $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{iP}+\mathrm{T}$
    For simplicity in exposition this analysis is presented in terms of the present value of $R$ in perpetuity $\quad V=R i$
    where $\mathrm{V}=$ present value of an asset which returns R annually in perpetuity.

    $$
    \mathrm{V}=\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{T} \mathrm{i}
    $$

