COWS & plows

Costs Associated with Alternative Grazing Systems

There are a variety of grazing practices and pasture management systems that can be used to improve pasture productivity, extend forage availability or reduce pasture acreage requirements. The selection of a grazing system should be based on the benefits obtained compared with added costs. The following is a discussion of the costs associated with rotational grazing management, adding fertilizer and feeding stored feeds for a limited period. The attached table contains a summary of the estimated costs associated with seven examples of grazing scenarios.

Rotational grazing

Using a rotational grazing system can improve overall forage productivity and increase the per acre carrying capacity. The additional costs of rotational grazing may include the cost of internal fences, additional watering points, or increased hours of labor. A cost-effective method of dividing a pasture into smaller paddocks for rotational grazing is to use electric fences. Although the quantity and cost of building materials will vary for each operation, the estimated cost for a quarter mile of electric fence is about \$278 for materials and labor, plus the cost of the fence charger. The costs of installing a water system might include the tube, valves, fittings, pump and tanks needed to deliver water to the paddocks that are separated from the central watering point. Maintaining the internal fences, water systems and moving the cattle from one paddock to another may also require more labor and time. But, with these added costs comes the potential to improve the per acre carrying capacity.

Additional nitrogen

There are two common methods for increasing the amount of nitrogen available to forage plants in a pas-

ture. The first method is to spread a commercial fertilizer over the pasture each year. This method proves a measured amount of nitrogen fairly evenly over a field. The second method is to inter-seed a legume into the established pasture every three years. Although this method may have a lower annual cost than using a commercial fertilizer, the decision of which method to use should be based on the characteristics of the grazing area pasture. Legumes are more commonly used in rotational grazing systems.

Confined feeding

Feeding cow-calf pairs in a confined area for a limited period can extend pasture capacities. The costs associated with placing the cattle in a dry lot or confining them to a small "sacrifice" area include the cost of the feed, fencing, feeding equipment and facilities. Placing cow-calf pairs in a confined feeding area allows the remaining pasture to rest or grow during a period of stress from weather.

Summary

Although some pasture management systems may increase the variable costs of production, the reduced number and increased production of pasture acres could reduce total costs. Rotational grazing offers a strong advantage over continuous grazing.

Providing additional nitrogen also improves carrying capacity and total costs of production. The summary table contains an example of how the costs per breeding cow differ for different forage types, nitrogen sources and grazing strategies. These cost estimates are for each breeding cow, based on a cow-calf herd with 60 breeding females, 11 yearling heifers and two bulls.





cows & plows

Table 1. Summary of Cow-Calf Costs Under Different Grazing Scenarios, Per Breeding Cow Basis							
Predominant grass type	Bluegrass	Bluegrass	Bluegrass	Tallgrass	Tallgrass	Tallgrass	Tallgrass
Grazing system	Continuous	Continuous	Continuous	Continuous	Rotational	Rotational	Rotational
Nitrogen source		Fertilizer	Fertilizer	Fertilizer	Legume	Legume	Legume
Feeding period			6/15 -7/31			7/1 -8/15	6/15 -8/30
Acres/ cow	5.6	2.8	1.6	1.9	1.5	1.0	0.8
Variable costs							
Pasture & Fence maintenance	14.06	7.73	4.71	15.67	14.11	10.13	7.80
Fertilizer & ap- plication		83.87	46.87	55.25			
Annualized le- gume seeding					4.68	3.22	2.39
Summer feeding							
Hay @			11.60			11.60	22.53
Cornstalks @			26.25			26.25	48.13
Distiller Co-prod- uct @			20.21			20.21	37.06
Winter feeding	163.09	163.09	163.09	163.09	163.09	163.09	163.09
Crop residue graz- ing	11.67	11.67	11.67	11.67	11.67	11.67	11.67
Labor	126.93	126.93	137.43	126.93	126.93	137.43	148.17
Other operating costs	124.00	134.86	135.35	131.97	124.67	120.72	130.26
Total variable costs	439.75	528.14	557.19	504.58	445.15	504.32	571.08
Fixed costs							
Fence	7.03	5.01	3.74	4.06	13.28	11.49	10.11
Breeding herd, int & dep	97.81	97.81	97.81	97.81	97.81	97.81	97.81
Pasture rent equivalent	223.33	113.33	63.33	74.67	60.00	41.33	30.67
Machinery & facilities	75.95	75.95	81.20	75.95	75.95	81.20	83.85
Total costs	843.87	820.24	803.27	757.07	692.19	736.16	793.52
Carrying capacity and cost estimates are based on ISU Extension rations, calculations and other publications.							

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY University Extension

October 2007 / IBC07 - 7

. . . and justice for all The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, and marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Many materials can be made available in alternative formats for ADA clients. To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call 202-720-5964.

Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, Acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Jack M. Payne, director, Cooperative Extension Service, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames, Iowa.

