The Economics of Low Cost Parlors

A.S. Leaflet R2786

Larry Tranel, Dairy Field Specialist; Kristen Schulte, Farm Management Field Specialist, ISU Extension and Outreach

Problem Statement:

Many dairy producers (>40+% in Iowa) are milking in stall barns or antiquated milking parlors which are achieving only 25 cows milked per person per hour. In comparison, other producers are achieving 75 cows milked per person per hour in well-designed milking parlors. This difference represents a person being three times more efficient with use of labor which translates into significant differences in farm profitability between these milking systems.

ISUEO Dairy Team Programmatic Response:

Making milking easier and more labor efficient should be a primary goal for dairy producers who are milking less than 45 cows per person per hour. Most of these milking systems can be modernized in cost effective ways that usually payback in very reasonable timeframes using Low Cost Parlors (LCP).

The ISUEO Dairy team has developed an exceptional array of materials to facilitate these decisions and has worked individually with many producers and agri-industry professionals to implement successful LCP systems. Much of this information can be found at: http://www.extension.iastate.edu/dairyteam/milking-

http://www.extension.iastate.edu/dairyteam/milkingsystems.

Producers who have employed LCP have been very satisfied. But, the decision to leave the stall barn seems to be a mindset hurdle that many producers have difficulty assessing the how's and why's of making the switch to a more labor efficient system. Yet, after making the switch, one of the most common comments is "I should have built it a long time ago."

Economics of Low Cost Parlors: Decision Tools

The aim of this work is to assist producers to think through and critically evaluate the financial impact of taking an old stall barn or antiquated parlor and transforming it into a TRANS Iowa low cost parlor or similar model. The partial budget that follows aims at assisting producers in determining their net financial impact of making the change. Many producers make the change around the 80 cow mark so the example uses an 80 cow dairy herd with daily average milk production at 65 pounds per cow.

Table 1. is an annual partial budget analysis. In the top left portion are increased incomes and decreased expenses (positive impacts). In the top right portion are the increased expenses and decreased incomes (negative impacts). The

sum is totaled for the Net Annual Financial Impact. In addition, quality of life and other profit opportunities are variables that may have a financial value which producers may or may not want to include in the analysis.

The net annual financial impact is calculated based on many herd and financial assumptions which are listed (input) in the bottom two-thirds of the spreadsheet.

Beginning with the sample 80 cow herd size and the target of \$18/cwt. milk price, the estimated cost of the milking parlor is input along with estimated costs of changes to cow housing and other changes such as manure storage, etc.

An average cost for a low to medium cost milking parlor is around \$60,000 with 12 cows per side or \$2,500 per stall. Some have been built for under \$600 per stall and others cost close to \$5,000 per stall so there is great variation from one parlor to the next.

In addition to the cost of the parlor, some producers may need to add cow housing, manure storage or other facility costs when making the decision so those variables can be input or be a part of a separate investment decision. The years of useful life of the added facilities, 22 in this example, is important to know for capital recovery cost purposes. The value of the investment after its useful life, \$63,500 in total with parlor and other facilities summed. The interest rate of 5.5% was used for capital recovery cost purposes. The added insurance value of \$217,000 was used with the cost of \$0.005 per \$1,000 of insurance.

One of the major incentives to employ a LCP is the milking labor savings which is often more than double the previous efficiency of milking in a stall barn or antiquated parlor. In this example on 80 cows, milking labor went down from 7 hours per day to 3 hours per day.

Heat detection hours may increase or decrease and in this example the decrease was negative so it actually increased by .07 hours per day (only five minutes). Feeding labor decreased 0.6 hours per day and manure handling decreased 0.5 hours per day. Labor management decreased .15 hours per day. The sum of labor savings, with milking labor included is estimated at 5.2 hours per day with stationary herd size of 80 cows. (This sample data was extrapolated from LCP survey conducted by ISUEO Dairy team)).

In this transition to a parlor, production per cow is estimated to increase 6.5 pounds or 10% due to higher cow comfort changes, not just due to the milking parlor. For the same reason, somatic cell count is expected to decrease 20% with the changes in cow housing (cow comfort).

Feed costs are not estimated to change much as the herd in this example was fed with a TMR prior to the parlor. Likewise the cull rate is only expected to decrease 1% with less cows getting hurt in the freestall versus stall barn environment.

Table 1. Economics of Low Cost Parlors Partial Budget Spreadsheet Analyzer.

Economics of Low Cost Pa	lors			Annual Partial Budget	Analysis
Kristen Schulte, Farm Management S	pecialist a	nd Larry Trar	nel, Dairy Specia		
Positive Impacts			Negative Im		
Increased Incomes			Increased Expe	•	
Increased Milk Production	ട്ടാറ ഒരെ	ISU			\$5,567
	\$30,888			ry Cost of Parlor (Dep & Int)	\$5,56, \$15,857
Increased Milk Premiums Increased Cull Cow Sales	\$3,454	Extension D	Increased Feed	ry Cost of Housing/Other	\$15,85
	-\$680				-\$1,280
Total Increased Incomes	\$33,662	A		creased Cow Replacement Costs	
Decreased Expenses		1	Increased Utilit	ies and Supplies	-\$60
Reduced Heat Detection Labor	-\$256	R			
Reduced Milking Labor	\$14,600	Υ		Total Increased Expenses	\$36,32
Other Reduced Labor	\$4,941	TEAM	Decreased Inco	mes Expected	
Total Decreased Expenses	\$19,286			Total Decreased Incomes	\$0
Total Positive Impacts	\$52,948			Total Negative Impacts	\$36,328
Annual Value: 1) to Quality of Life	\$23,818		NET ANN	UAL FINANCIAL IMPACT =	\$16,620
2) Other Profit Opportunities :	\$5,000		with Quality of	f Life & Other Opportunities =	\$45,438
Herd and Financial Assumption			Units	Instructions or Refere	
	IIS	90			
Herd Size		-	no. cows	Enter herd size, lactating and	-
Milk Price			\$ per cwt milk	Typical range \$15.00 to \$21.0	
Estimated Cost of Milking Parlor			\$ for parlor	Include shell, framework & e	
Estimated Cost of Cow Housing Chang			\$ per farm	Typical range of \$0 to \$2,500/	
Estimated Cost of Other Changes (mai	nure, etc.)		\$ per farm	Typical range of \$0 to \$1,500/	cow
Years of Useful Life		-	years	Typical rage is 15 to 30 years	
Value of Parlor after Useful Life	ow Hoofed Lif		\$ per farm	Typical range of 10 to 20% of	
Value of Housing & Other Changes aft	er oserui Lii		\$ per farm	Typical range of 10 to 30% of	
Interest Rate of Money		0.50		Value of own or borrowed m	•
Insurance Rate per \$1,000 Value Increased Insurance Value of Changes	vs Current		\$ per farm	Typical rate is 0.5% per 1,000 Added investment value over	
increased insurance value of Changes		abor Change		Added IIIVestillelit valde ove	i current sys
Current Hours of Milking Labor	•		hours per day	Include set-up and cleanup	
Anticipated Hours of Milking Labor			hours per day	Include fetching cows and cle	Panun
Reduced Hours for Heat Detection Lab	or		hours per day	Typical is -0.75 to +.75 hours	carrap
Decreased Hours for Feeding Labor	OI .		hours per day	Typical is 0 to 0.5 hours	
Decreased Hours for Manure Handling			hours per day	Typical is 0 to 1.2 hours	
Labor Rate for General Labor Activities			\$ per hour	Typical rate is \$8 to \$18 with	henefits
Reduced Hours for Labor Managemen			hours per day	Include hiring, training, over	
Labor Rate for Labor Management			\$ per hour	Typical rate of \$12 to \$25	seemg, etc.
	Milk Produc	tion and Qua		Typical face of \$12 to \$25	
Lbs of Milk per Cow per Day, Past Year			lbs/cow/day	Typcial range of 50 to 90 lbs	
Projected Change in Milk Production		_	lbs/cow/day	Typical 0 to 10% more 2x	
SCC Premium per 1,000 SCC Change			\$ per cwt	Typically \$0.002 - \$0.004/cwt	
Current Annual Bulk Tank Average SCO	`		SCC per ml	Typical range of 100,000 - 400	
Estimated Percent Change in SCC		-20.0		Typical range of -25 to +25%	,,000 300
zotimate a r er de int en ange in e e e	Feed Cos	ts and Intake		17p.ca. range 31 23 to 12576	
Lbs of TMR Dry Matter (DM) per lb of N			lb DM/lb Milk	Typical range of 0.55 to 0.8	
Cost per lb of TMR Dry Matter		\$0.145	\$ per lb DM	Typical range of \$0.09 to \$0.1	45 in 2013
Estimated Change in cost/lb Dry Matte	r	-\$0.001	\$ per lb DM	Typical range of -\$0.003 to +\$	0.003
	ulling and H		nent Changes		
Cost of Replacement Heifer		_	\$ per heifer	Typical range of \$1,300 to \$2,	
Cull Price per Cow (or sold for milking			\$ per cow	Typcial range of \$450 to \$1,20	00
Expected Change in Annual Turnover			%	Typical range of -3% to +8%	
	tilities and S		es for Milking		14.0
Anticipated Change in Electricity cost			\$/cow/year	Typical decrease of 0 to 150 k	cwh
Anticipated Change in Water cost Anticipated Change in Chemicals Cost			\$/cow/year	Typical range of -\$5 to +\$5	
COUNTRIES OF DANGE IN Chemicals Cost		50.00	\$/cow/year	Typical range of -\$2 to +\$2	

Electrical costs are expected to decrease about \$8 per cow per year due to the parlor versus stall barn milking. Water and chemical costs are not expected to change from one system to the other.

With all these variable input, the net financial impact of the low cost parlor relative to the current system is \$16,620. If a value for quality of life (easier milking, more free time, etc.) is added at \$23,818 and a value for other profit opportunities (ability to milk more cows, do better job, etc.) is added at \$5,000 annually, the total value of modernizing to a milking parlor is \$44,438. In essence, even with building cow housing and manure storage, low cost parlors can create great financial impact and rid farms of a huge labor bottleneck.

Cash Flow Implications of the Low Cost Parlor

In addition to the net financial impact, producers need to understand the cash flow implications of the transition to a low cost parlor. First, capital recovery cost used in the net financial impact is different than the principal and interest payment on the loan used in the cash flow. Second, the labor savings were given a financial value. But, if portions of the labor savings were not previously paid, then an adjustment needs to be made if that savings of labor is not turned into cash. It could be turned into cash if a better job managing the other aspects of the operation happens that creates profit equal or above the labor savings. If not, the difference needs to be adjusted from cash flow implications

relative to the net financial impact where unpaid labor savings was given a value.

Below is a loan amortization for a 20 year loan of \$250,000 at 5.5% interest. Total annual payment is \$20,637 which is slightly more than the \$21,424 capital recovery cost on the parlor. Therefore, \$787 is added to the \$16,620 of net financial impact from our previous example. In addition, even though \$14,345 of labor was saved from milking and heat detection, only \$5,000 was hired meaning \$9,345 needs to be subtracted from the net financial impact. Other labor savings was \$4,941 with none of that previously hired meaning that amount also needs to be subtracted from the net financial impact. So, although the net financial impact was \$16,620 the cash flow change was only \$3,121.

Summary

In summary, the TRANS Iowa Low Cost Parlors have been a great financial and personal investment for dairy producers. The decision to employ a LCP is difficult as producers need a mindset change relative to stall barn milking while understanding many variables that go into making the change. The Economics of Low Cost Parlors spreadsheet can assist producers. Producers may be able to make the change with little or no changes to cow housing or manure storage. Others may have sizeable costs to one or both. Either way, the variables can be analyzed to determine whether or not the LCP is a good decision for a particular dairy farm as depicted by net financial impact.

Loan <i>F</i>	Amortiza	tion for		Low Cost	Parlor		
20 Years of	Loan		Annual Inte	rest		Principal Am	ount
12 Annual	Payment(s)		Rate	5.50%		\$250,000	
40 Total Pa	yments						
First Mo	onth	Interest	t	Prinicpal	Tota	l Payment	
Paymen	it	\$1,146		\$574		\$1,720	
First Yea	ar	Interest	t	Prinicpal	Tota	l Payment	
Paymen	t	\$13,750		\$6,887		\$20,637	
			s of Low C			Totals	
			s of Low C			Totals \$16,620	
	nual Financi	al Impact		Budget Ana		\$16,620	
	nual Financi Capital Re	al Impact	from Partial	Budget Ana and Other	lysis	\$16,620	
Net Ann	Capital Re	al Impact covery Co yment on	from Partial st of Parlor a	Budget Ana and Other tment	lysis \$21,424 \$20,637	\$16,620	
Net Ann	Capital Re Annual Pa	al Impact covery Co yment on ce of Capi	from Partial st of Parlor a Parlor Invest tal Recovery	Budget Ana and Other tment vs Annual F	\$21,424 \$20,637 Payment	\$16,620	
Net Ann	Capital Re Annual Pa w Differen	al Impact covery Co yment on ce of Capi ent for Ur	from Partial st of Parlor a Parlor Invest tal Recovery	Budget Ana and Other tment vs Annual F	\$21,424 \$20,637 Payment	\$16,620 \$787	
Net Ann	Capital Re Annual Pa w Differen	al Impact covery Co yment on ce of Capi ent for Ur	from Partial st of Parlor a Parlor Invest tal Recovery npaid Labor a	Budget Ana and Other tment vs Annual F and Manage Saved	\$21,424 \$20,637 Payment ment \$14,345	\$16,620 \$787	
Net Ann	Capital Re Annual Pa w Differen ow Adjustm Heat Dete	al Impact covery Co yment on ce of Capi ent for Ur ction & Mi	from Partial st of Parlor a Parlor Invest tal Recovery npaid Labor a Ilking Labor S Amount Hire	Budget Ana and Other tment vs Annual F and Manage Saved ed	\$21,424 \$20,637 Payment ment \$14,345 \$5,000	\$16,620 \$787 -\$9,345	
Net Ann	Capital Re Annual Pa w Differen ow Adjustm Heat Dete	al Impact covery Co yment on ce of Capi ent for Ur ction & Mi	from Partial st of Parlor a Parlor Invest tal Recovery npaid Labor a	Budget Ana and Other tment vs Annual F and Manage Saved ed e, labor mgt	\$21,424 \$20,637 Payment ment \$14,345 \$5,000	\$16,620 \$787 -\$9,345	