



# The Optimal Cow Size for Intermountain Cow-Calf Operations

*Jesse Russell*, Agricultural & Business Mgmt. Economist, Colorado State University Extension  
*Dillon Feuz*, Head, Applied Economics, Utah State University

## Introduction

Producers in the cattle industry are continually striving to improve efficiency of their herds and satisfy market demand for the quality, size and characteristics of their product. Optimal cow size has been a topic of debate partially due to the fact that over the last 30 years, cattle have been selected for feedlot performance, weaning and yearling weights. This selection has increased the average cow size from 1,000 lbs. to 1,400 lbs. (Schmid 2013).

Research has shown that as a cow's mature weight increases, feed efficiency decreases, as well as reproductive efficiency and other production factors.

The purpose of this paper is to illustrate the differences economically between three different cow weights (1,000 lbs., 1,200 lbs. and 1,400 lbs.) on three different resource bases. The first resource base (resource base 1) is able to graze the cow herd year round with minimal supplementation. The second resource base (resource base 2) requires the operation to provide the cow herd with all nutritional requirements for 3 months of the year through the use of mechanically harvested forages. The third resource base (resource base 3) requires the cow herd to be provided with all nutritional

requirements for 6 months of the year through the use of mechanically harvested forages. This paper is based on the findings of Russell (2014).

## Production

The same production benchmarks were used for each cow weight on each resource base. However, Hersom (2009) pointed out that as mature weight increases, the age at puberty increases. Similarly, as weight increases the percent of heifers cycling and conception rate decreases. Hersom also showed that as cow size increased, calving rate decreased. This difference in calving rate specifically led to a reduced ability to remain in the herd (cull rate). Large cows had a cull rate of 52% compared to a 19% cull rate for smaller cows in the first 5 years. He also showed weaning rates for first and second calves were greater for the smaller cow sizes compared to large cows where overall weaning rates were less than 50%.

## Carrying Capacity

Hersom (2009) also discusses cow feed efficiency and shows that a cow herd's feed requirements amount to 50% to 75% of the annual maintenance costs of the herd. He points out the importance of grazing as much as possible, and that stocking density then becomes increasingly important as well. He shows the difference in

nutrient requirements for a 1,000 lb. cow and a 1,200 lb. cow during early lactation (3 months after calving), at weaning (7 months before calving), and late gestation (1 month before calving). Hersom showed that no matter the stage of production the heavier cow always requires a larger quantity of dry matter as well as total digestible nutrients and crude protein.

Because of narrowing profit margins and increasing costs, cattle producers must evaluate their management practices. Riggs (2009) noted that maintenance requirements of the cow account for about 70% of the feed consumed, leaving the remaining 30% for production. This means the 70% of feed used for maintenance provides no economic returns.

Dhuyvetter (2009) showed the difference in the weaning weights as a percentage of a cow's body weight. A 1,000 lb. cow will wean approximately 48.5% of her body weight, a 1,200 lb. cow will wean 45.8% of her body weight and a 1,400 lb. cow will only wean 43.6% of her body weight. Dhuyvetter also illustrates the points: as cow body weight increases 1) stocking rate decreases; 2) calf weaning rate increases; but 3) the percentage of the cow's body weight weaned decreases.

The most accepted method of calculating carrying capacity is done by calculating an animal unit equivalent (AUE). The formula for determining an AUE is as follows:

$$\text{Animal Unit Equivalent (AUE)} = \frac{(\text{Live animal weight})^{0.75}}{1,000^{0.75}}$$

Using this formula the animal unit equivalents were found for each weight and class of animal during the grazing season, as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Animal Unit Equivalents.**

Cow Wt.	1,000 lb.	1,200 lb.	1,400 lb.
Cows	1	1.15	1.29
First-Calf Heifers	0.9	1.02	1.13
Replacement Heifers	0.79	0.89	0.99

Table 2 shows the difference in carrying capacity of an operation that is able to run 500 mother cows weighing 1,200 lb., 92 first-calf heifers and 100 replacement heifers. The same operation is able to run 74 more 1,000 lb. mother cows and 54 fewer 1,400 lb. mother cows on the same resource base.

**Table 2. Carrying Capacity.**

Cow Wt.	1,000 lb.	1,200 lb.	1,400 lb.
Cows	574	500	446
First-Calf Heifers	106	92	82
Replacement Heifers	115	100	89

### Expenses

The resources that are available to an operation will largely determine feed expenses. However mature cow weight also plays a role. Russell (2014) shows that supplement costs per head for hay and range cubes (protein) increase with body weight in all cases. When charged for federal and state grazing permits on a true Animal Unit Month (AUM) basis, the lighter cows have a lower feed cost and a higher total cost. However, as illustrated in Table 3, the higher total cost is due to the increased number of lighter cows a given resource base is able to sustain.

**Table 3. Costs When Charged on a True AUM Basis.**

Cow Weight	1,000 lb.	1,200 lb.	1,400 lb.
All Animals	795	692	617
<b>Resource Base 1</b>			
Fixed Cow Cost	\$106,756	\$93,023	\$82,927
Feed Costs	\$201,018	\$202,640	\$205,600
Total Costs	\$307,774	\$295,663	\$288,527
Cost per Head	\$387.14	\$427.26	\$467.63
<b>Resource Base 2</b>			
Fixed Cow Cost	\$113,340	\$98,760	\$88,042
Feed Costs	\$251,686	\$253,585	\$255,404
Total Costs	\$365,026	\$352,345	\$343,445
Cost per Head	\$459.15	\$509.17	\$556.64
<b>Resource Base 3</b>			
Fixed Cow Cost	\$119,296	\$103,950	\$92,830
Feed Costs	\$292,152	\$293,711	\$295,788
Total Costs	\$411,448	\$397,660	\$388,618
Cost per Head	\$517.54	\$574.65	\$629.85

Table 4 shows that when an operation is charged for federal and state grazing permits on a per head basis, as is the normal practice, the heavier cows have the higher feed costs and total costs. These points drive us to examine revenues from nine different options

**Table 4.** Costs When Charged on a per Head Basis.

Cow Weight	1,000 lb.	1,200 lb.	1,400 lb.
All Animals	692	692	692
<b>Resource Base 1</b>			
Fixed Cow Cost	\$93,023	\$93,023	\$93,023
Feed Costs	\$175,687	\$191,772	\$209,135
Total Costs	\$268,710	\$284,794	\$302,158
Cost per Head	\$388.31	\$411.55	\$436.64
<b>Resource Base 2</b>			
Fixed Cow Cost	\$98,760	\$98,760	\$98,760
Feed Costs	\$219,837	\$246,484	\$272,285
Total Costs	\$318,597	\$345,244	\$371,045
Cost per Head	\$460.40	\$498.91	\$536.19
<b>Resource Base 3</b>			
Fixed Cow Cost	\$103,950	\$103,950	\$103,950
Feed Costs	\$255,097	\$289,300	\$322,211
Total Costs	\$359,047	\$393,250	\$426,161
Cost per Head	\$518.85	\$568.28	\$615.84

## Revenue

Since calf revenue generally represents 75% to 90% of operating revenue it is imperative to raise calves that maximize revenues while minimizing expenses (optimize net returns). It is also important to understand that lighter calves tend to sell for a higher price per pound than heavier calves, while heavier calves tend to bring greater revenue per head than the lighter calves. Furthermore, price per head for cull animals generally increases with body weight.

However as carrying capacity goes up so does the number of cattle culled. At first glance one may think that selling the larger animal will generate the greatest net return, but considering the difference in stocking rate on a fixed resource base this does not always hold true.

Based on the stocking rate for a given resource base, the number of calves weaned at a 90% weaning rate is illustrated in Table 5. This table also shows calf weight based on mature cow weight. The

amount of revenue generated by an operation will also depend on retention of calves for growing and/or heifer development. Table 5 shows a larger number of light weight calves will generate more revenue.

**Table 5.** Calves Weaned and Weaning Weight.

Cow Weight	1,000 lb.	1,200 lb.	1,400 lb.
<b>Steers</b>			
Calf Weight Weaned Calves	500	565	630
\$/lb.	\$1.45	\$1.33	\$1.28
Steer Revenue	\$221,850	\$199,886	\$191,923
<b>Heifers</b>			
Calf Weight Weaned Calves	470	535	590
\$/lb.	\$1.29	\$1.23	\$1.21
Heifer Revenue	\$185,528	\$175,041	\$169,908
<b>Steers and Heifers</b>			
Total Calf Revenue	\$407,378	\$374,927	\$361,831

## Net Returns

When grazing fees are charged on a true AUM basis, Russell (2014) shows the lighter cattle generating the greatest net return for all resource bases even though resource base three had a negative return for all cow sizes (Table 6). Table 7 shows the differences in net returns on a per cow basis when grazing fees are charged on a per head basis as is more typically the case.

**Table 6.** Net Returns per Cow When Charged on a True AUM Basis.

Cow Wt.	1,000 lb.	1,200 lb.	1,400 lb.
Cows Bred	680	592	528
<b>Resource Base 1</b>			
Net Return Per Cow	\$ 51.30	\$ 39.28	\$ 36.73
<b>Resource Base 2</b>			
Net Return Per Cow	\$135.50	\$135.03	\$140.74
<b>Resource Base 3</b>			
Net Return Per Cow	(\$16.96)	(\$37.26)	(\$47.63)

**Table 7.** Net Returns per Cow When Charged on a per Head Basis.

Cow Wt.	1,000 lb.	1,200 lb.	1,400 lb.
Cows Bred	592	592	592
<b>Resource Base 1</b>			
Net Return Per Cow	\$134.72	\$153.39	\$177.11
<b>Resource Base 2</b>			
Net Return Per Cow	\$50.46	\$51.28	\$60.75
<b>Resource Base 3</b>			
Net Return Per Cow	(\$17.87)	(\$29.81)	(\$32.35)

### Grazing Costs on Public Lands

There is a difference in the net returns when the grazing fees are charged on a true AUM basis compared to charging on a per cow basis, which is the current method used by the federal and state agencies. When the major constraint for an operation is the amount of forage available on public lands, and grazing fees are charged on a per cow basis, then carrying capacity does not change based on AUE or cow weight. When carrying capacity does not change with cow weight, then there is not enough increase in net returns for the lighter cattle to offset the decrease in the costs of the heavier cattle.

The carrying capacity of all three resource bases when state and federal grazing permits are charged on a per head basis is 500 head of cows and will require 92 first-calf heifers and 100 replacement heifers regardless of weight to maintain the herd. However, this policy in the long run, likely contributes to over grazing of range allotments which may then result in a forced reduction in the number of permitted cattle on an allotment.

### Conclusion

This data strongly suggests that if producers are charged for grazing public lands on an AUE basis that a 1,000 lb. cow would generate the greatest return on all three resource bases. However, in reality producers are charged on a per head basis for grazing their cattle on public lands. This current policy from the perspective of maximizing profit results in the 1,400 lb. cow being the best option for resource bases 1 and 2. This suggests that the current state and federal grazing rate policies do

play a part in the cow size that is selected by producers on these two resource bases. However, on resource base 3, the 1,000 lb. cow loses the least amount of money. The results suggest the current grazing rate policies have little or no effect on cow size selected by producers on resource base 3.

In this and other research, it has been shown that body weight effects dry matter consumption and indicates that charging for grazing fees on a per head basis is not an accurate method of charging for the amount of forage removed. Not accounting for different forage intake from different sized cows could have a negative effect on range condition.

Each rancher should carefully evaluate resources and select the cow size that will be best for his or her operation. This research has shown that “Bigger is not always Better”.

### References

- Dhuyvetter, J. 2009. Focusing on Cows in a High Cost World. <http://www.ag.ndsu.edu/north-centralrec/livestock-extension/pps/Focusing%20on%20Cows%20in%20a%20High%20Cost%20World.pdf/view> (accessed May 13, 2014)
- Hersom, M. 2009. Relationship of Cow Size to Nutrient Requirements and Production Management Issues. University of Florida Extension.
- Riggs, B. 2009. Fitting the Cow Herd to the Environment. <http://beefcattle.ans.oregonstate.edu/html/publications/BEEF007-FittingtheCowHerdtotheEnvironment.pdf.pdf>. (Accessed March 2014).
- Russell, Jesse, “The Optimal Cow Size for Intermountain Cow-Calf Operations: The Impact of Public Grazing Fees on the Optimal Cow Size” (2014). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3575. <http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/3575>
- Schmid, K. 2013. Bigger Is Not Always Better: Finding the Right Sized Cow | BeefResearch.ca. <http://www.beefresearch.ca/blog/finding-the-right-sized-cow/>. (Accessed March 2014).

Utah State University is committed to providing an environment free from harassment and other forms of illegal discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age (40 and older), disability, and veteran’s status. USU’s policy also prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in employment and academic related practices and decisions.

Utah State University employees and students cannot, because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or veteran’s status, refuse to hire; discharge; promote; demote; terminate; discriminate in compensation; or discriminate regarding terms, privileges, or conditions of employment, against any person otherwise qualified. Employees and students also cannot discriminate in the classroom, residence halls, or in on/off campus, USU-sponsored events and activities.

This publication is issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Kenneth L. White, Vice President for Extension and Agriculture, Utah State University.