



TCSCF

53020 Hitchcock Ave.
Lewis, IA 51544
Ph.: 712-769-2600
Fax: 712-769-2610

2011 Observations of the TCSCF Sire Profit Comparison Project

Daryl R. Strohbehn and W. Darrell Busby
ISU Professor Emeritus and TCSCF Manager

The main objective in Tri-County Sire Profit Analysis is to assist producers with the comparison of sires from a profit standpoint. Every aspect of agriculture today requires sound economic decisions and raising beef in today's economy is no exception. This summary has grown from 35 sires in 2003 to 3,131 evaluated in 2011 and 656 reported in the printout. This year over 60,000 head of cattle were evaluated, but TCSCF does not print sire averages and comparison unless there are 5 or more progeny by the bull. Additionally, in 2010 the board of directors decided to print only sires that had progeny born in 2008 and after.

Economic conditions change from year to year, but for long term planning it is imperative to use a mix of futuristic thinking, yet relying on the tried and true from the past few years. Back in 2008 SPA cow costs, feed costs, Choice-Select spreads, base and carcass prices were updated. They remain the same so the field of evaluation stays static, thus improving on what the genetics are telling us. These decisions are thought out so that reports from previous years fit in with the 2010 report.

It seems like the more things change in our daily lives the more things sometimes stay the same in other aspects. What does it take to make profit? Certainly not changing in economic importance are carcass weight, growth and end product quality(see correlation table). Other traits that can make a large difference are health in the feedlot, muscling and feed conversion. But complacency in the thought and evaluation process can lead to big mistakes. Sires doing poorly in one trait can have huge implications from a profit standpoint. It seems like sires in the top one-fourth have to be average or better in just about all the economically important traits. Formula for a high profit sire: sire heavier than average calves with excellent disease immunity, grow fast and efficient, produce more end product, slightly heavier muscled and of higher quality grade.

Sires were compared using a value-based grid with either a low or high Choice/Select spread. Again in 2010, there was little change in how sires ranked with two systems.

When you evaluate sires for use please realize that not all top ranking sires make it there for the same reason. Some sires have superior growth and end product weight, while others have superior carcass quality attributes and only moderate growth. Some, however, do above average in all areas. Perfection in a sire is nearly impossible, so like we have said in the past, improving your program is a matter of plugging weakness holes in your herd. In 2009 TCSCF went one step further to assist you in the discovery process; it's called BENCHMARKING.

Call us for details on getting your Critical Performance Record Summary.

TCSCF Phenotypic Trait Correlations with Lifetime Profitability, 60,061 head analyzed

Delivery weight = .49	Fat cover = -.06
Final weight = .67	Yield Grade = -.03
Feed to gain = -.36	Marbling score = .25
ADG = .60	Low Choice or better = .54
Carcass weight = .73	Health Trmt cost = -.28
Dress percent = .32	Cost of gain = -.39
Rib eye area = .55	Calf Value = .49

Comparison of Top Profit Bulls to Bottom Profit Bulls: 2009-11

Trait	Sire Groupings		
	Top 25%	Bottom 25%	All Sire Average
Number of Sires ==>	164	164	656
Feedlot Performance			
Delivery Weight	700	640	671
SPA Calf Value	\$525	\$493	\$509
Ave. Disposition Score	1.85	1.88	1.86
Overall ADG	3.37	3.15	3.26
Final Weight	1227	1155	1191
Feed to Gain	6.76	6.87	6.82
Feed Cost/cwt of Gain	\$84.50	\$85.88	\$85.25
Health Performance			
Individual Health Treatment Costs	\$6.39	\$11.84	\$8.42
Carcass Performance			
Hot Carcass Weight	759	704	732
Dressing Percent	61.9%	61.0%	61.5%
Fat Cover	0.45	0.47	0.46
Ribeye Area	12.7	12.1	12.4
Ribeye Area/cwt. Of Carcass Weight	1.67	1.72	1.69
Yield Grade (calculated)	2.87	2.91	2.91
% Low Choice or better	81.2%	55.9%	69.5%
% Upper Choice or better	18.3%	7.9%	12.9%
Profitability			
Average Lifetime Profitability	\$194	\$149	\$172