



USDA Choice
Yield Grade – 2
ADG – 3.7
Calculated Net Return – \$121.00



USDA Choice
Yield Grade – 2
ADG – 4.4
Calculated Net Return – \$124.00

Arkansas Feedout Program

2001-2002 Summary Report

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Calf Management.....	1
In-Depth Summary of the 2001-2002 Feedout Program	2
Health Status and Death Loss	2
Financial Results	3
Performance Results	4
Carcass Results	5
Industry Standards	6
Factors Affecting Steers' Feedlot Net Return	7
Summary.....	12

Arkansas Feedout Program

2001-2002

Tom R. Troxel, Shane Gadberry, Bill Wallace, Sammy Cline and George Davis
University of Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service
Animal Science Section

Introduction

The University of Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service Feedout Program provides cow-calf producers the opportunity to acquire information about postweaning performance and carcass characteristics of their calves. It also points out the factors that influence value beyond the weaned calf phase of beef production. The program is not a contest to compare breeds or breeders or to promote retained ownership. The Feedout Program creates an opportunity for producers to determine how their calf crop fits the needs of the beef industry. The program also provides the information needed to determine if changes in genetics and/or management factors are warranted to be competitive in beef production.

Calf Management

On November 8, 2001, 350 calves (30 heifers and 320 steers) from 37 Arkansas producers representing 18 counties were placed on feed at Oklahoma Feeders Inc., Coyle, Oklahoma. Calves were eartagged, weighed and processed on November 9, 2001. Steers and heifers were sorted into five feeding groups based on weight, frame and flesh condition. Management factors such as processing, medical treatments and rations were the same as the other cattle in the feedyard. The feedyard manager selected animals for harvest when they reached the weight and condition regarded as acceptable for the industry and market conditions. Cattle were sold on a carcass basis with premiums and discounts for various quality grades, yield grades and carcass weights. Feed, processing and medicine costs were financed by the feedyard. All expenses were deducted from the carcass income, and proceeds were sent to the owner.

Because there were only 30 heifers, the heifer data are reported as averages and were not statistically analyzed. One heifer died during the feeding period. Of the 320 steers that started in the fall, eight died (2.5% death loss), and six carcasses were used by IBP (Iowa Beef Processors) for quality control checks. These steers were not included in the statistical analyses. Therefore, 306 steers were used in the analyses.

In-Depth Summary of the 2001-2002 Feedout Program

Health Status and Death Loss

The sick rate was very high with 71 calves (22.8%) treated for sickness. It is not known what caused this high sick rate, but the weather during November and December was thought to have contributed. The average medicine cost per sick calf was \$35.21. The medicine cost for the entire group averaged \$11.52 per head. The health status of cattle in the feedyard usually has a major impact on performance and profit. Healthy steers had higher feedlot net returns (\$489) than steers that became sick (\$413; $P < 0.001$). In addition, healthy steers had higher final weights (1,154 vs. 1,114 lbs; $P < 0.01$), average daily gains (3.30 vs. 3.14; $P < 0.02$), lower total cost of gain (\$0.51 vs. \$0.61; $P < 0.001$), higher carcass values per cwt. (\$105.09 vs. \$103.47; $P < 0.06$) and higher carcass weights (729 vs. 701 lbs; $P < 0.001$) than steers that became sick. No differences were detected in dressing percentage, feed cost of gain, days on feed, carcass value, ribeye area, ribeye area per cwt. and yield grade.

Sickness impacted the calves' ability to grade Choice. More healthy steers (35%) graded Choice than steers that were treated for sickness (24%). Less than 1% of the calves were classified as Dark Cutter and there were no differences between healthy steers and those steers that were treated for sickness. The abnormally dark-color of the lean is referred to as Dark Cutters. The color of the muscle can range from dark red to nearly black and has both a sticky texture and a high water-holding capacity. Dark cutters are caused by low muscle glycogen at the time cattle are harvested. Glycogen depletion of dark-cutting beef can be caused by strenuous muscular activity or by psychological stress. It has also been shown that the differences between the daytime highs and the nighttime low temperatures can affect dark cutting in beef. During late April and early May when the steers were slaughtered, the daytime highs were seasonally above normal. This could have caused an increase in dark cutters especially in the steers that were already somewhat stressed as a result of being sick.

This vividly points out the need to adhere to a sound health management plan. By implementing a sound vaccination program at the ranch of origin, predictability and consistency of calves increases product value and calves have the opportunity to express their genetic potential. Most deaths in a feedyard are due to pneumonia. In this feedout program, eight steers died due to respiratory problems.

Variability in health is built into the calf market. Buyers factor this into what they are willing to pay because they buy calves as a commodity. There are cattle feeding operations that are willing to pay more for good quality cattle that have been properly immunized and properly backgrounded. The amount they can pay is dictated by the increase in the added value of benefits and also the quantity of similar type cattle, which can be purchased and managed as a unit.

Financial Results

Tables 1 and 2 show a summary of the financial statement for steers and heifers, respectively.

**Table 1. 2001-2002 Arkansas Feedout Summary
Financial Results - Steers^a**

	Average (\$)	Range (\$)
Gross Income	757.50	384 to 1,020
Expenses		
Feed	242.56	181 to 346
Freight, yardage, processing, interest, etc.	33.83	24 to 124
Medicine	10.41	0 to 208
Total	286.80	219 to 496
Feedlot Net Return	470.70	48 to 711
In Value	475.70	340 to 654
Calculated Return	-5.00	-418 to 244

^a 306 head

**Table 2. 2001-2002 Arkansas Feedout Summary
Financial Results - Heifers^a**

	Average (\$)	Range (\$)
Gross Income	672.22	403 to 911
Expenses		
Feed	227.22	198 to 289
Freight, yardage, processing, interest, etc.	27.49	24 to 34
Medicine	23.07	0 to 147
Total	277.78	229 to 386
Feedlot Net Return	394.44	174 to 606
In Value	423.61	352 to 533
Calculated Return	-29.17	-222 to 156

^a 29 head

A farm break-even value was calculated by dividing the feedlot net return by the in weight. If the feeder calf could have been sold in the fall of 2001 for more than the farm break-even value, financially it would have been better to sell the calf last fall than to feed it. The steers' farm break-even averaged \$0.78 (average in weight was 600 pounds) and ranged from \$0.08 to \$1.25 per pound. The heifers' farm break-even averaged \$0.72 (average in weight was 551 pounds) and ranged from \$0.34 to \$1.13.

Table 3 is a financial summary of the bottom 25%, top 25% and average for steers. Table 4 is the financial summary for the heifers. This table reports averages and the ranges for each category.

Table 3. Financial Summary of the Bottom 25%, Top 25% and Average Steers Based on Feedlot Net Return

	Bottom 25%	Top 25%	Average
Number of Steers	78	78	
Gross Income (\$)	641 ^a	870 ^b	758
Carcass Value Per Lb. (\$)	0.99 ^a	1.09 ^b	1.04
In Value per head (\$)	437 ^a	492 ^b	476
Medicine per head (\$)	23.90 ^a	2.37 ^b	10.41
Feed Cost per head (\$)	230 ^a	247 ^b	243
Total Expense (\$)	286	283	287
Feedlot Net Return (\$)	355 ^a	586 ^b	471
Calculated Return (\$)	-82 ^a	94 ^b	-5.00
Days on Feed	173 ^a	164 ^b	168
Feed Cost Per Lb. of Gain (\$)	0.45 ^c	0.43 ^d	0.45
Total Cost Per Lb. of Gain (\$)	0.56 ^a	0.50 ^b	0.54

^{a, b} Values within rows with unlike superscripts are significantly different (P < 0.001).

^{c, d} Values within rows with unlike superscripts are significantly different (P < 0.03).

Table 4. Financial Summary for the Heifers' Feedlot Net Return

	Average	Range
Number of Heifers	29	
Gross Income (\$)	672	403 – 911
Carcass Value Per Lb. (\$)	1.05	0.77 – 1.15
In Value per head (\$)	424	352 – 533
Medicine per head (\$)	23.07	0 – 147
Feed Cost Per Head (\$)	227	198 – 289
Total Expense (\$)	278	229 – 386
Feedlot Net Return (\$)	394	174 – 606
Calculated Return (\$)	-29.29	-222 – 156
Days on Feed	171	156 - 177
Feed Cost Per Lb. of Gain (\$)	0.48	0.36 – 0.73
Total Cost Per Lb. of Gain (\$)	0.59	0.44 – 0.90

Performance Results

The average steer in weight and final weight were 600 pounds (range = 397 to 860 lb.) and 1,144 pounds (803 to 1,434 lb.), respectively. Average daily gain was 3.25 pounds and ranged from 1.89 to 4.67 pounds. The performance summary of the bottom 25%, top 25% and average based on feedlot net return is shown in Table 5, and the heifer averages are summarized in Table 6.

Table 5. Performance Summary of the Bottom 25%, Top 25% and Average Steers Based on Feedlot Net Return

	Bottom 25%	Top 25%	Average
In Weight (lb.)	541 ^a	622 ^b	600
Muscle Score	1.4 ^a	1.3 ^b	1.3
Frame Score			
Large	10% ^a	29% ^d	25%
Medium	90% ^a	71% ^d	74%
Small	0%	0%	1%
Final Weight (lb.)	1,056 ^a	1,201 ^b	1,144
Average Daily Gain (lb.)	2.98 ^a	3.53 ^b	3.25

^{a, b} Values within rows with unlike superscripts are significantly different (P < 0.001).

Table 6. Performance Summary for the Heifers

	Average	Range
In Weight (lb.)	551	428 - 817
Muscle Score	1.4	1 to 2
Frame Score		
Medium	93%	
Small	7%	
Final Weight (lb.)	1,033	889 – 1,277
Average Daily Gain (lb.)	2.82	1.93 – 4.12

Carcass Results

Overall, 33 percent of the steers graded Choice, which is less than the national average (56%). One percent graded Prime, and 10 head received a premium for Certified Angus Beef. Tables 7 and 8 summarize the carcass data for steers and heifers, respectively.

Table 7. Carcass Summary of the Bottom 25%, Top 25% and Average Steers Based on Feedlot Net Return

	Bottom 25%	Top 25%	Average
Hot Carcass Weight (lb.)	645 ^a	797 ^b	723
Carcass Value (\$/lb)	0.99 ^a	1.09 ^b	1.04
Dressing Percentage	61.3% ^a	66.6% ^b	63.2%
Ribeye Area (sq. in.)	12.1 ^a	13.2 ^b	12.7
Backfat	0.35 ^a	0.46 ^b	0.42
REA per 100 lb. carcass weight	1.85 ^a	1.64 ^b	1.76
Quality Grade			
Prime	1%	1%	1%
Choice	4% ^a	64% ^b	33%
Select	69% ^a	32% ^b	57%
Standard	23% ^a	3% ^b	9%
Dark Cutter	3%	0%	< 1%
Yield Grade	1.92	2.06	2.66

^{a, b} Values within rows with unlike superscripts are significantly different (P < 0.01).

Table 8. Heifer Carcass Summary

	Average	Range
Hot Carcass Weight (lb.)	638	521 – 817
Dressing Percentage (%)	61.7	54 – 74
Ribeye Area (sq. in.)	11.9	9.80 – 15.9
Backfat	0.41	0.20 – 0.68
REA per 100 lb. carcass weight	1.69	1.27 - 2.58
Quality Grade		
Prime	0	
Choice	48%	
Select	48%	
No Roll	4%	
Yield Grade	2.62	

Industry Standards

The standards for the beef cattle industry are Choice quality grade, yield grade of # 3.5, and hot carcass weight between 550 and 950 pounds. Thirty-three percent of the steers fit these industry standards. Table 9 shows the steers that met the industry standards averaged \$80 per head more than those that did not fit the industry standards ($P < 0.01$). They also had higher carcass values (\$1.10 vs. \$1.02) because they graded Choice and were not discounted for yield grades greater than 4.0 or for carcasses outside the weight range. The breed composition of those cattle that fit the industry standards was 33.6% Continental, 57.1% English and 9.3% Brahman.



USDA Choice
Yield Grade – 2
ADG – 3.7
Calculated Net Return – \$121

USDA Choice
Yield Grade – 2
ADG – 4.4
Calculated Net Return – \$124



Table 9. Feedlot Net Return, Average Daily Gain and Carcass Value for Steers that Did or Did Not Meet Industry Standards

Item	Met Standards	Did Not Meet Standards	Difference
Feedlot Return	\$525	\$445	\$80 ^a
Average Daily Gain (Lbs)	3.32	3.24	NS
Carcass Value	\$1.10	\$1.02	\$0.08 ^a

^aP < 0.0001

Factors Affecting Steers' Feedlot Net Return

Listed below are the significant (P < 0.01) factors that affected feedlot net return for steers and heifers in the 2001-2002 Feedout Program. Factors are listed in descending order of importance.

Rank	2001 - 2002
1.	Hot Carcass Weight
2.	Days On Feed
3.	Medicine Cost
4.	Quality Grade
5.	Dressing Percentage
6.	Yield Grade
7.	Feed Cost of Gain
8.	Average Daily Gain

- Hot Carcass Weight** - The relationship between hot carcass weight and feedlot net return was positive. That is to say as hot carcass weight increased so did feedlot net return. The more carcass pounds sold the greater the gross income and feedlot net return. Table 10 shows the relationship between hot carcass weight, total cost of gain, average daily gain, feedlot net return and calculated return.

Table 10. Summary of Hot Carcass Weight, Total Cost of Gain, Average Daily Gain, Feedlot Net Return and Calculated Return

Hot Carcass Weight (lb.)	Total Cost of Gain (\$)	ADG (lb.)	Feedlot Net Return (\$)	Calculated Return (\$)
< 600	0.56	2.6	267	-131
600-699	0.53	3.1	419	-28
700-799	0.54	3.3	491	-0.73
800-899	0.51	3.6	584	74

Hot carcass weight discounts were observed for carcasses weighing less than 550 pounds and greater than 950 pounds.

Factors that affect hot carcass weight include frame size, muscle thickness and backfat. Muscle thickness is a major factor that relates to carcass weight. Thickness, depth and fullness of quarter, and width (without excessive fat) of back, loin and rump are indications of muscling. Muscling or natural fleshing is inherited through the sire and dam.

The current USDA Feeder Cattle Grades utilize four muscle thickness scores (1 = thicker, 2 = slightly thick, 3 = narrow and 4 = very narrow). Thickness is related to muscle-to-bone ratio and at a given degree of fatness to carcass yield grade. Thicker muscled animals will have more lean meat. "Double-muscled" animals are included in the Inferior grade (unthrifty animals). Although such animals have a superior amount of muscle, they are graded U.S. Inferior because of their inability to produce acceptable degrees of meat quality.



USDA Choice	HCW-666 lbs.
Yield Grade-2	Calculated Net Return-\$18

The ideal calf should be Feeder Cattle Grade U.S. 1. Number 1 is thrifty and moderately thick throughout. They are moderately thick and full in the forearm and gaskin, showing a rounded appearance through the back and loin with moderate width between the legs, both front and rear.



USDA Select
Yield Grade - 3
HCW - 762 lbs.
Calculated Net Return - \$69

USDA Choice
Yield Grade - 1
HCW - 771 lbs.
Calculated Net Return - \$121



2. **Days on Feed** - Cattle were sold on April 16, April 30 or May 7, 2002. There was a negative relationship between days on feed and feedlot net return. That means that on the average, the longer the steers were on feed the lower the returns (Table 11). Days on feed were not a factor affecting the feedlot net return for the heifers because all heifers were sold and slaughtered on the same days.

Table 11. Effect of Days on Feed on Average Daily Gain, Total Cost of Feed, Carcass Value and Feedlot Net Return

Slaughter Date	Days on Feed	ADG (lb.)	Total Cost of Gain (\$)	Carcass Value (\$)	Feedlot Net Return (\$)
April 16	156	3.4	0.53	1.09	524
April 30	170	3.2	0.52	1.01	421
May 7	177	3.2	0.55	1.03	456

One factor that affected the relationship between days on feed and feedlot net return was the price difference between Choice and Select quality grades. On April 16, there was a carcass discount of \$3.00 per cwt. between Choice and Select but on April 30 and May 7 the carcass price spread widened to \$5.00 and \$10.00 per cwt., respectively. Generally, there is a seasonal pattern regarding discounts between Choice and Select. Often, the spread between Choice and Select is very low early in the year. That spread starts to widen during the late spring months and usually continues to widen into early fall. The Choice-Select spread is usually widest during the late fall and winter period.

A second factor that affected the relationship between days on feed and feedlot net return was a decrease in the price of cattle from April 16 to April 30 and May 7. Choice Yield Grade 3 carcasses were sold for \$109 per cwt. on April 16 but the price dropped to \$101 and \$103 per cwt. for the cattle sold on April 30 and May 7, respectively.

3. **Medicine Cost** - Healthy calves outperformed sick calves. A good preconditioning vaccination program will not guarantee a healthy feedyard calf, but it is the best management tool available. Healthy calves had a higher feedlot net return (\$489 vs. \$413) than calves that were treated for illness. A higher percentage of healthy steers graded Choice than did the sick calves.
4. **Quality Grade** - Cattle that graded Choice, Select, Standard and Dark Cutter had feedlot net returns of \$532, \$452, \$384 and \$258 ($P < 0.001$), respectively. Marbling is the main factor that affects a calf's ability to grade Choice. Three main factors that affect marbling are: (1) the genetic ability to marble; (2) the maturity or the physiological age, not the chronological age; and (3) diet. Some cattle breeds report marbling EPD's in their sire summary. Carcass traits such as marbling are highly heritable; therefore, selecting high marbling EPD bulls can impact the marbling ability of their progeny. Breeds can also influence a calf's ability to grade Choice. Calves with a high percentage of English breeding usually have an increased ability to grade Choice.

The physiological age versus chronological age influences frame score. Large frame cattle must be older (chronologically) to reach the same physiological age to express marbling as compared to smaller frame cattle. Steers should have frame scores of 5 to 6. That means that at 7 months of age a steer should be 44 to 46 inches tall at the hips.

Cattle are more likely to grade Choice at a lighter weight when fed a high concentrate ration versus a high forage diet. Successful feedlots feed a high concentrate ration to finishing cattle; therefore, cattle diet is not a factor.



USDA Choice
Yield Grade – 2
HCW – 662 lbs.
Calculated Net Return – \$59



USDA Select
Yield Grade – 2
HCW – 743 lbs.
Calculated Net Return – \$29



USDA Standard
Yield Grade – 1
HCW – 650 lbs.
Calculated Net Return – \$-2

5. **Dressing Percentage** - The relationship between dressing percentage and feedlot net return was positive. As dressing percentage increased so did feedlot net return. Many of the factors that affect hot carcass weight (addressed in Number 1) also affect dressing percentage. The top 25% of steers (based on feedlot return) had a dressing percentage of 66.6% compared to 61.3% for the steers in the bottom 25%.
6. **Yield Grade** - As yield grade increased from 1 to 3, feedlot net return decreased (\$492, \$439 and \$466 for yield grades 1, 2, and 3, respectively). Yield grade 4 is not desired by the beef industry and thus receives a large discount in price. Backfat, ribeye area, hot carcass weight and percentage of kidney, pelvic and heart fat are the factors that determine yield grade. As yield grade (1 to 4) increases, the amount of fat increases in relation to the amount of lean.



USDA Choice
 Yield Grade – 3
 HCW – 684 lbs.
 Calculated Net Return – \$29.00

7. **Feed Cost of Gain** – Feed cost of gain takes into account many different factors such as average daily gain, health, feed cost, feed efficiency, frame score, muscle score, etc. Generally, feed cost of gain is inversely related to average daily gain, that is as average daily gain increases, feed cost of gain decreases. Therefore, as feed cost of gain goes down, feedlot net return increases.
8. **Average Daily Gain** – As shown in Table 10, average daily gain is related to hot carcass weight, which is the most important factor affecting feedlot return. Through genetic selections using bulls with higher than breed average yearling weights EPD's will improve average daily gains. Average daily gain is also positively related to feed conversion. That is as average daily gain increases, feed conversion also improves. One word of caution when placing a lot of selection pressure on growth traits, and that is growth traits are positive related to birth weights and negative related to maternal traits. Therefore, pay close attention to birth weigh and maternal traits EPD's when selecting a bull. It is very important to select a bull with balanced EPD's.

Summary

The purpose of the Arkansas Feedout Program is to provide the opportunity for cow-calf producers to determine how their cattle fit the needs of the industry. Unfortunately, the participants experienced selling cattle in a down market. The price of cattle dropped significantly between the spring of 2001 and 2002. The average live price in 2001 was close to \$80 per cwt. whereas the average live price in 2002 was in the low \$60's per cwt. On a 1,200-pound calf that is a price difference of approximately \$240. Remember, the cattle industry was experiencing record high prices during the spring of 2001. Carcass prices also decreased. In the spring of 2001, carcass prices were \$1.25 per pound and in 2002 prices averaged \$1.04 per pound. On an 800-pound carcass, that is a difference of \$168.

Perhaps this year is a good example to show that good cattle can still make money in a down year. The average calculated return per head for the top 25% of the steers was \$94. The top steers were on feed 164 days, gained 3.53 pounds per day, averaged 797 pounds carcass weight and graded 64% Choice with no Dark Cutters.

We want to congratulate the producers who participated in the 2001-2002 Feedout. It takes courage to put calves in the feedyard and obtain this data. Hopefully, these cattle producers will take this information and make beef cattle genetic changes to improve their cattle herd.

Arkansas Feedout Program

2002 - 2003

An Information Feedback System for the Beef Industry

- ~ **Nominations Must Be Received by October 1, 2002** ~
- ~ **Five Head Minimum Per Consignor** ~
- ~ **\$25 Per Head Nomination Fee** ~
- ~ **Cattle Must Weigh 500-850 Pounds upon Arrival** ~
- ~ **Delivery Date – November 7, 2002 by 5:00 p.m.** ~
- ~ **Oklahoma Feeders, Coyle, OK** ~

1. A producer may consign as many lots as desired. A lot consists of five steers. When nominations are received, producers will be sent a background information form that must be fully completed and returned before entries are final.
2. Only **calves weighing 500-850 pounds** upon arrival will be accepted. A feedyard ear tag for each calf will be mailed to the producer through the county agent. Each calf must have the ear tag in place when the calves arrive at the feedyard. Each calf should also be tagged with a ranch ear tag. This will provide a double identification system.
3. It is strongly recommended that the calves are backgrounded prior to leaving the farm. A general recommendation would be to wean 30-45 days prior to shipment (November 7, 2002). At the time of weaning, vaccinate with a modified live virus vaccine (IBR-PI3-BVD-BRSV). Revaccinate 2 to 3 weeks after the first vaccination. Consult with your local veterinarian to assess what health needs should be addressed.
4. Assistance will be provided in coordinating shipment to the feedyard. Indications of requests for this type of assistance must be made on the nomination information form and **must be received by October 1**. If a producer would like to deliver their own calves, they must arrive at Oklahoma Feeders on November 7, 2002 by 5:00 p.m. Call Oklahoma Feeders (405-586-2468) for directions.
5. Upon arrival, cattle will be processed according to standard feedyard procedure.
6. Cattle will be sorted into an appropriate number of expected outcome groups based on weight, frame size and flesh condition.
7. Animals that require treatment for any illness will be treated according to guidelines established by the feedyard veterinarian. Costs of treatment will be charged to the owner. The feedyard management and the Arkansas Feedout Program management will make every effort to safeguard the health of all animals, but will assume no responsibility for death loss or sickness.
8. After an acceptable length of time, calves that are not achieving an economic rate of gain will be sold as realizers and the proceeds placed in escrow for disbursement at the end of the program. Owners will be notified when such calves are salvaged and when one of their calves dies.
9. Feed consumption for each pen will be determined at the time of close out. Individual calf consumption will be dependent on the in weight and average daily gain.
10. Charges to be assessed each entry at the end of the feeding period include: (a) processing fee, (b) medicine costs, (c) feed cost, (d) trucking costs, (e) items A thru D will be financed at the prevailing interest rate and (f) Beef Check Off (\$1.00/head).
11. Entries will be marketed when individuals reach the weight and condition regarded as acceptable by the industry. The feedyard manager will make this decision.
12. Calves will be weighed individually at the conclusion of the feeding period and a 4% pencil shrink will be applied to the final weight to determine live sale weight for calculation of feedyard performance.

13. The cattle will be sold on a carcass basis. Premiums and discounts for quality grades, yield grades and carcass weights will be established prior to slaughter. Fair market value for all sales will be attained, but neither the feedyard nor Arkansas Feedout Program management guarantees the profitability of participation in the program. Proceeds will be mailed to the consignor after the expenses listed in item 10 are deducted. Disbursement of funds will be approximately two weeks after each pen is closed out.
14. Feedyard performance information to be collected: average daily gain, total cost of gain, break-even and net return.
15. Carcass information to be collected: dressing percentage, carcass weight, ribeye area, fat thickness, USDA yield grade and USDA quality grade.
16. Producers will be sent a report after arrival at the feedyard with information on arrival weight and pen assignment.
17. At the conclusion of the feeding period, feedyard performance data and carcass information will be provided on each consignment. The information will be kept confidential for consignors to use in evaluating the cattle they are producing.

For more information, contact your local county Extension agent.

Nomination Form

Ranch _____

Contact Person _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

County _____

Phone No. **Day** () _____ **Night** () _____

Steers: Head Entered _____ x \$25 Per Head = \$ _____

_____ Yes, I would like assistance to ship my calves to the feedyard.

NOMINATION FORM DUE OCTOBER 1, 2002
 Make Check Payable to: **Agricultural Development Council**

DELIVERY DATE:
 Oklahoma Feeders, Inc., Coyle, OK
 November 7, 2002 by 5:00 p.m.

MAIL ENTRIES TO:
 Tom Troxel
 Arkansas Feedout Program
 PO Box 391
 Little Rock, AR 72203

The Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service offers its programs to all eligible persons regardless of race, color, national origin, religion, gender, age, disability, marital or veteran status, or any other legally protected status, and is an Equal Opportunity Employer.