# ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE UNITED STATES CERVID FARMING INDUSTRY



Agricultural and Food Policy Center Texas A&M University

August 2007



Department of Agricultural Economics Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Texas Cooperative Extension Texas A&M University College Station, Texas 77843-2124 Telephone: (979) 845-5913 Fax: (979) 845-3140 http://www.afpc.tamu.edu

# Acknowledgements

In no way could the study have been completed without the outstanding efforts of the members and leadership of both the North American Deer Farmers Association (NADeFA®) and the Texas Deer Association (TDA). We truly appreciate all of the members who took the time to complete and return the survey. In addition, we sincerely thank all of those who took time out of their schedules to educate us and let us see your operations first hand. Specifically, from NADeFA®: Fred Huebner, Holly Johnson, Glenn Dice, Julie Getschmann, and Shelly Burns. From the TDA: Scott Bugai, Dick Cain, and Lisa Barton. The following people and operations: Robert Williams of RW Trophy Ranch, Buddy Jordan of Indian Creek Ranch, Trophy Ridge Ranch (Dick Cain), Buck Naked Trophy Whitetails (Scott Bugai), Stephen Frisina of Celebrity Ranch, Tom Malouf of Malouf's Trophy Whitetails, Robert Gegenheimer of Cotton Mesa, Dave McQuaig of Cougar Ridge Whitetails, Mike Hine of Timberghost Ranch, Pat Cooper, Russ Walk of Walk's Whitetails, Dean Borntrager of Sundance Whitetails, Levi Mast of Mast's Whitetails, Dave Griffith Brothers Whitetail Ridge, and Tim Tague and Doug Berty of Double T Ranch.

# ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE UNITED STATES CERVID FARMING INDUSTRY

David P. Anderson Brian J. Frosch Joe L. Outlaw



Agricultural & Food Policy Center Department of Agricultural Economics Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Texas Cooperative Extension Texas A&M University

APFC Research Report 07-4

August 2007

College Station, Texas 77843-2124 Telephone: 979.845.5913 Fax: 979.845.3140 Web site: http://www.afpc.tamu.edu/

# **Executive Summary**

- The cervid farming industry is, perhaps, the fastest growing industry in rural America.
- Over 2,000 industry participants were surveyed, with a response rate of 14 percent.
- This survey, designed to estimate the economic impact of the industry, was performed in late 2006-early 2007.
- The average whitetail deer farm had 82 deer, composed of 28 males, 28 females, 26 fawns, and had an average birth rate of 1.31 fawns per doe in 2006.
- Breeding operations reported expenditures averaging \$101,000 per year.
- The cervid farming industry has a direct economic impact of \$893.5 million.
- When incorporating the indirect impacts of the industry, for example, the farm's expenditures on feed, veterinary supplies, fuel and other purchases, the total economic impact of the industry is \$2.3 billion.
- One of the major customers of this industry is hunters. Estimating the impact of hunting dollars spent, with hunters as
  the consumer of cervid farming products, an additional \$757 million is generated by the cervid farming industry.
- The total impact of the industry, combining the farming and hunting components, is \$3.0 billion annually.
- The economic activity of the cervid farming industry supports 29,199 jobs, most of which are in rural America. If this industry did not exist, those jobs would have to be supported by some other economic activity.
- These results highlight the fact that the cervid farming industry is a growing and important industry in rural America.



# Introduction

The cervid, or deer, farming industry is a vital and growing business in rural areas of the United States. As demographic and market forces tend to shift traditional revenue sources away from rural communities, their economies increasingly rely on new industries such as this one. As the industry has grown, participants and legislators have developed an interest in measuring the economic contribution of the industry on their respective communities. In addition, the industry is governed by a myriad of state and federal laws, regulations, and jurisdictions. Since the majority of industry regulation is left up to the states, a significant amount of variability in the regulations exists from state to state. This lack of consistency in laws and regulations may be a factor affecting future industry growth in some states. The rapid growth of the industry and an array of policy issues led the industry to request this study of the size and economic importance of the cervid farming industry. In 2006, the Agricultural and Food Policy Center (AFPC) at Texas A&M University was requested by former Texas Congressman Henry Bonilla to undertake this study. The primary objective of this study is to determine the economic impact of the United States cervid farming industry. Secondary objectives include providing a current description of typical industry participants and cost estimates for the major categories of expenses on cervid farming operations.



# **Cervid Industry**

The term "cervid" refers to any one of the various members of the cervidae family. This family includes members such as whitetail deer, elk, fallow, reindeer, axis, sika, and red deer among others.<sup>1</sup>

Like any industry, the cervid farming industry involves producers and consumers. In general, the production side of the industry is comprised of breeding stock producers, trophy hunting preserves, commercial venison producers, and commercial scent collection. Some commercial production operations may take on a single segment, such as one producing and selling only breeding stock. Others may consist of any combination of these, such as an operation producing venison and velvet, while also collecting urine for scent sales. Consumers of the industry include hunters (for scent products and hunting) other breeders, and consumers of venison and related products (hides, velvet, shed antlers, etc.).

Figure 1 displays the estimated number of cervid farms per state. This inventory was compiled by the administrative staff at the North American Deer Farmers Association (NADeFA®) through contact with the appropriate state agency. Those states that did not have an exact count provided their best estimate. Across the nation, the total number of cervid farms was 7,828, with Pennsylvania and Texas home to around 1,000 farms each. The total number of hunting preserves is estimated at 2,639, yet this only represents an estimate of those that are related to the cervid farming industry. As an example of the growth the cervid farming industry is experiencing, there were 946 permitted breeding facilities in Texas in late summer 2006. However, when the analysis took place early in the spring of 2007, there were 1,006 permitted facilities. In addition, it is important to note that there are approximately 1,600 Amish operations included in the national total. For many in the Amish communities, deer breeding is another way to diversify their operations. A number of industry participants find that this form of farming provides an opportunity to turn a greater profit on a relatively small amount of acreage than traditional farming or ranching enterprises.

The trophy hunting segment of this industry relates only to those operations that purchase outright or release their own cervids into a hunting preserve. This segment represents the primary end market for the breeding stock industry. Trophy hunting, in this sense, involves hunting trophy cervids within high fenced hunting preserves. This generally occurs via 3-6 day hunt packages, where the hunter is provided lodging, meals, and a guided hunt for a set fee. Hunter expenditures included in this study only include those hunters that are related to this industry. In other words, hunters, in the context of this study, are only those that hunt at operations that either purchase or release deer from breeding operations into their hunting operations. Breeding operations represent the largest segment of the cervid farming industry. These operations raise and sell breeding stock to other industry breeders as well as hunting preserves. The commercial venison segment is similar to other food animal production operations, with fallow, elk, and red deer being the primary species reared. Cervids are raised to market age, processed, and the resulting venison is sold. In addition to venison, these operations may sell other co-products such as velvet, hides, and antlers. The last segment is the commercial urine, or scent, collection operations. These operations are found to stand alone or co-exist with other operational segments, where the urine is collected from males and females to sell as a hunting attractant.

<sup>1</sup> "Cervid." The American Heritage<sup>®</sup> Science Dictionary. Houghton Mifflin Company. 20 Jul. 2007. Dictionary.com <u>http://dictionary.reference.com/</u> browse/cervid



# Figure 1: Number of Cervid Farms by State.

# Methodology

As previously mentioned, the primary objective of this study is to estimate the economic impact of the United States cervid farming industry. In order to do this, a survey instrument was developed to collect detailed operational information from industry participants. This information was then combined with the inventory of cervid farms to analyze the production side of the industry. In addition, an analysis was performed to determine the impact of hunters, but only the portion of hunters who are related to the cervid farming industry. The production and hunting components were then combined to estimate the economic impact of the cervid farming industry.

# Data Collection

During the late summer and early fall of 2006, background information to develop the survey was gained through site visits to cervid farms across the nation. Interviews from these visits provided a base set of information that was then utilized to develop the survey instrument. The survey was then reviewed by industry participants, revised, and sent to over 700 members of NADeFA<sup>®</sup> and 1,300 members of the Texas Deer Association (TDA) over the fall of 2006 to early 2007. Overall, the extensive survey achieved a response rate of 14 percent. These memberships were selected to participate in this study because they represent all facets of the cervid farming industry.

# Survey Development

The actual survey instruments are contained in Appendix A (NADeFA®) and Appendix B (TDA). For the purposes of the survey, the cervid farming industry was segmented into three operational structures: breeding only, breeding and hunting, and hunting only operations. Breeding only operations were defined as those that only involve the scientific breeding and rearing of cervids for the purpose(s) of breeding stock, commercial venison, or commercial urine collection. Hunting only operations relate to only those hunting preserves that purchase cervids from breeding operations as stockers or as breeding stock for release into the preserve. Operations that manage their deer populations by selective harvest and nutritional supplements, rather than supplementing the natural genetics with deer released from breeding operations, are not included in this category. Breeding and hunting operations represent those that engage in breeding activities while also utilizing their own breeding stock, or purchased breeding stock, to supplement the genetics and/or populate their hunting preserve.

While a majority of the industry are whitetail deer producers, a variety of cervid species are raised as well, including elk, red deer, mule deer, sika, pere david's, reindeer, axis, fallow, and muntjak. The surveys proved to be quite extensive, as they were designed to represent producers of all of these cervid species and operational segments. For breeding operations, the survey included questions regarding the operation in general, herd inventory, purchases, sales, capital expenditures, veterinary expenditures, labor, feeding rates and expenditures, utilities, and other miscellaneous expenses. For hunting operations, the base operational questions remained the same, however, hunting related questions were included as well, such as the number of hunters, harvest rate, percentage of herd from breeding operations, hunt revenues, processing, and taxidermy.

# Figure 2: Typical Fenced Paddock.



# SURVEY RESULTS

# **Survey Results**

# **General Operations**

Of the 302 respondents, 61 percent were breeding only operations, 32 percent were breeding and hunting operations, and 7 percent were hunting only operations. Respondents represented 26 of the 48 states that have some type of cervid operation. When combining all survey respondents, operations have been in business, on average, since 1999.

From the NADeFA® survey results, the average whitetail deer breeding operation reported a total of 82 deer, on close to 25 acres. Of these, 28 were bucks, 28 were does, and 26 were fawns. In 2005, bred does had an average of 1.24 fawns each, which increased to 1.31 for the 2006 fawning season. Average annual mortality rate was reported to be 9.6 percent. For comparison, whitetail breeding operations from the Texas survey were slightly larger, averaging 114 head, on a little more than 64 acres. Of these, 42 were bucks, 44 were does, with the remainder being fawns. Bred does averaged 1.27 fawns each in 2005 and 1.37 in 2006, slightly higher than the national results. Overall herd mortality rate was reported to be 5.7 percent.

Table 1 above contains a summary of the average operational costs across all survey respondents. A quick glance through the table reveals expected differences across operations for general expenditures. Breeding and hunting operations displayed the largest footprint, around 1,700 acres, as expected. Breeding only operations were the smallest, averaging around 20 acres in pens. Pens, in this sense, are typically described as a high fenced paddock, as shown in Figure 2. For those pens holding bucks or bulls, a protective screening is often used in conjunction with the fence to keep an antler from hooking in the fence accidentally. In addition, screening may be used as a visual barrier, particularly if the operation is near a road, to shield the deer from view from passers-by.

Breeding and hunting operations had more area devoted to breeding pens, more pens overall, and more deer (Table 2) than breeding only operations. This was expected as the breeding and hunting operations supply their hunting operation from their breeding operation, and are not necessarily relying on sales or transfers to move deer off the operation.

The results indicate expenditures on lodges, fencing, and improvements were the top three in terms of the capital cost for both breeding and hunting and hunting only operations, while breeding operations spent the most on fencing, buildings, and improvements. The category of improvements includes expenditures on land clearing, roads, tanks/ ponds, and forage development among others. Large equipment, ranch vehicles, and implements were reported as the highest equipment expenditures across all three types of operations. Of all the respondents, 49 percent reported hiring labor, while 43 percent reported outsourcing labor and/or consulting needs. Breeding and hunting operations reported using four times the amount of outsourced services than breeding only operations, or \$16,456 versus \$4,042. Examples of outsourced services include those of operational management and or nutritional consulting, bottle feeding services for newborns, annual herd maintenance/vaccination services, and accounting services.

Figure 3 provides a summary of expenditures for a typical breeding operation. Survey categories, such as those shown in Table 1, were combined into four primary expense categories: capital, operational, feed, and general. Figure 3 il-lustrates the annual expenses for breeding operations. Operational expenditures include items such as supplies, labor,



# Figure 3: Annual Breeding Operation Expenditures.

Table 1: Average Annual Operati	onal Costs of Cervic	l Industry Survey Respo	ondents.
( in dollars)	Breeding Only	Breeding & Hunting	Hunting Only
Operation			
Year started	1999	1998	1998
Area of breeding (acres)	22	80	NA
Area of hunting (acres)	NA	1,639	1,123
Land purchased (acres)	139	895	1,022
Purchase value (\$/ac)	3,166	1,729	1,407
Facilities	-		·
Capital cost of lodge(s)	NA	172,673	159,326
Number of pens	8	13	NA
Area of pens (acres)	20	25	NA
Fencing	27,201	144,039	94,592
Shelters	6,980	14,479	NA
Improvements	17,270	81,750	63,507
Buildings	19,693	80,262	55,961
Working pens	10,336	18,366	NA
Percent with Handling Facility	64%	54%	NA
Cost of Handling Facility	15,627	36,502	NA
Maintenance and Repair	2,907	18,731	12,143
Equipment			
Large equipment	33,009	93,268	61,665
ATV(s)	9.325	19.841	14.391
Ranch vehicles	29.422	55.470	37,208
Implements	9.578	26.510	20.038
Trailers/crates	6,300	14,421	9,228
Bulk feed bins	4.045	13.063	7,490
Feeding equipment	3.667	16,759	9.497
Watering equipment	2.398	9.413	9.046
Video equipment	1.916	3.473	2.003
Rental equipment	1,184	4,716	3,424
Sedation equipment	1,178	1,778	NA
Veterinary & Supplies			
Operating supplies	3,557	5,560	NA
Medical supplies	1,675	2.674	NA
Veterinary expense	2.257	4,121	NA
Lodge supplies	NA	5.237	5,183
Lodge food and beverages	NA	5.021	5.023
Labor		- / -	- )
Employees paid salary	2	2	2
Employees paid bourly	2	3	2
Total salary wages paid	35,613	65.801	39.608
Average annual salary wage expense	23 667	28 985	22 134
Total hourly wage paid	8.398	26,805	13,689
Average annual hourly wage expense	5.522	9.856	9.468
Outsourced services	4.042	16.456	12.097
Utilities	.,	,	,
Itilities	1 618	7 551	4 535
Fuel	2 103	10 070	4,000 5 104
Miscellaneous Exponsos	2,100	10,070	0,104
	1 015	5 016	2 662
Advortising/marketing	טוש, ו ררי ר	0,810 8,007	0,000 6 102
Travel	2,022	0,U97 6 200	2 061
Dronerty tax	2,000	6,500	3,004 1 062
FIDPELLY LAX	∠,413	0,004	4,000

utilities, insurance, advertising, and travel. Capital expenses refer to annualized capital costs for items such as land, improvements, fencing, buildings, breeding stock, feeding equipment, ATV's, and implements. Feed refers to the annual feed costs, including supplemental feed, hay, and bottle feeding supplies. Lastly, General costs cover the remainder of expenditures on items such as food plots, artificial insemination, veterinary, and disease monitoring.

# Production

Table 2 contains a summary of production data across all respondents. Feed represents a little over 11 percent of total annual expenditures for breeding operations. From venison production to breeding stock operations, proper nutrition is essential to the physical health, development, and overall well being of all cervids. For breeding only operations with whitetails, 53 percent of respondents indicated bottle feeding their fawns, while only 29 percent of breeding and

Table 2: Average Production Data of Cervid Indust	try Survey Respondents.
---	-------------------------

	Breeding Only	Breeding & Hunting
Herd Inventory (Final 2005)		
Whitetail		
Males	21	49
Females	25	51
Fawns	23	48
Birth rate (2005)	1.3	1.2
Birth rate (2006)	1.4	1.3
Annual Mortality Rate	8%	7%
Elk		
Males	18	12
Females	24	9
Fawns	16	3
Fallow		
Males	43	3
Females	94	4
Fawns	50	*
Red Deer		
Males	46	47
Females	57	66
Fawns	35	27
Feeding		
Whitetail		
Fawns		
Percent bottle feeding	53%	29%
Percent of fawns bottle fed	53%	44%
Average bottle feeding days until weaning	98	91
After weaning		
Daily protein feed rate (lbs)	2	2
Daily hay feed rate (lbs)	1	1
Does		
Daily protein feed rate (lbs)	3	3
Daily hay feed rate (lbs)	2	1
Bucks		
Daily protein feed rate (lbs)	4	4
Daily hay feed rate (lbs)	2	2
Elk		
Males		
Daily protein feed rate (lbs)	6	6
Daily hay feed rate (lbs)	10	10
Females		
Daily protein feed rate (lbs)	4	7
Daily hay feed rate (lbs)	10	10
Fallow		
Males		
Daily protein feed rate (lbs)	0.4	2
Daily hay feed rate (lbs)	4	*
Females		
Daily protein feed rate (lbs)	0.3	2
Daily hay feed rate (lbs)	4	*
Red Deer		
Males		
Daily protein feed rate (lbs)	5	3
Daily hay feed rate (lbs)	7	3
Females	-	-
Daily protein feed rate (lbs)	4	3
Daily hav feed rate (lbs)	6	3
Area of food plots (acres)	14	47
Seed	813	2,560
Fertilizer	1 011	2,000
Protien feed price (per ton)	318	305
Hav price (per ton)	193	268
	100	200
* Insufficient results		

hunting operations did. Of all species, bottle feeding is primarily practiced with whitetail fawns. Other species will not typically incur such management practices, where bottle feeding may only be utilized for orphaned or sick young.

On average, adult whitetail males were fed close to 4 pounds of supplemental feed per day, while elk consumed slightly over 6 pounds. All of the reported species were fed a protein concentrate and hay. Hay costs were extremely high during the study period due to severe drought conditions across most of the southern plains. In addition to purchased feed, 74 percent of all respondents reported planting food plots on their operations, ranging from half an acre to 500 acres.

When combining results, 70 percent of all breeding or breeding and hunting operation respondents indicated some type of breeding stock purchase. This would include purchases of breeder males, stocker males, bred females, open females, fawns, or semen straws. For whitetail, breeder bucks were the highest dollar expense, costing close to \$21,000 each on average.

# **Hunting Operations**

Operations with hunting reported other expenses in addition to those of breeding operations. Seventy-six percent of all respondents of operations that reported to be involved in hunting had a lodge on the premises for their clients. In addition to the roughly \$170,000 cost of the lodge, these operations also accrued expenses to maintain and supply the lodge. Labor costs were reported to be higher than those of breeding operations due to an overall larger operation, as well as seasonal hunting guides. Food plots in the hunting areas tended to be larger, along with more feeders, waterers, and fencing, all contributing to the higher reported expenses. Although the majority of hunting operations accepted paying clients and corporate clients, 14 percent reported their hunting operation as personal use only. Of the whitetail hunting operations reporting, respondents estimated an average of 49 percent of the deer in their hunting areas are from breeding operations. Of all the respondents, 49 percent reported hiring labor, while 43 percent reported outsourcing labor and/or consulting needs. For breeding operations, those hiring salaried employees reported an annual expense in the mid \$20,000 range. This expense increased to the mid \$30,000 range for breeding and hunting operations. On the whole, labor hired on an hourly basis tended to be more prevalent than salaried labor.

Feed was the third largest expense category, representing a little over 11 percent of annual expenditures for breeding operations. Although it's not the largest expense category, feeding is considered to be one of the most important aspects of all operations. From venison production to breeding stock operations, proper nutrition is essential to the physical health, development, and overall well being of all cervid operations. For fawns, 45 percent of respondents indicated bottle feeding their young. Typical products used for bottle feeding ranged from goat's milk to different brands of milk replacer. On average, adult whitetail males were fed close to 4 pounds of supplemental feed per day, while elk consumed slightly over 6 pounds. Respondents indicated paying a little over \$300 per ton for supplemental feed, while hay costs averaged around \$240 per ton. In addition to purchased feed, 74 percent of all respondents reported planting food plots on their operations, ranging from half an acre to 500 acres.



IMPLAN<sup>®</sup> (Impact Analysis for Planning), an input/output model, was used to estimate the economic impact of the cervid farming industry on the national economy. Originally developed by the USDA Forest Service, the IMPLAN model is now managed and maintained by the Minnesota IMPLAN Group (MIG). The model is, arguably, the most used and cited model for performing economic impact analyses in the United States.

The IMPLAN model is driven by purchases of final goods and services in a certain region, such as a state, a group of states, or the entire nation. These purchases represent the dollar value of the increase in finished goods and services demanded, and create an impact that ripples throughout the economy.

Industries produce goods and services for final use and purchase goods and services from other industries. These other producers and industries buy goods and services as well, which IMPLAN designates as indirect purchases. In addition, each step along the cycle pays wages and salaries to employees, who, in turn, make additional expenditures into the economy of the region.<sup>2</sup>

In determining the overall economic impact of an industry, the IMPLAN model uses a set of multipliers, separated by sector, to estimate the direct, indirect, and induced effects (induced being effects of household spending) of the economic cycle. Over 500 sector codes are included in the IMPLAN model, where each code represents a unique industrial sector that a specific product or category of products is represented by. The multipliers that are derived for each sector quantify the ripple effects of a dollar increase in final demand, thus resulting in an estimation of the economic impact.<sup>3</sup>

# Cervid Industry

In determining the economic impact of the cervid farming industry, the categories of the survey were prepared for input into the IMPLAN model. This was accomplished by extrapolating the survey results against the inventory of operations to arrive at total industry expenditures for each category. These totals represent the value of final goods and services demanded by the industry, and were the baseline inputs for the IMPLAN model. Categories from the extrapolated survey results, such as supplemental feed or fencing, are then assigned a sector code according to the underlying industry the category relates to. Table 3 provides an example of category inputs and their multipliers from IMPLAN, with each category belonging to a different sector. Differences between the multipliers for each category demonstrate how dollars move throughout different industries. For instance, a \$1 million change in final demand for supplemental feed will generate a total of \$2.67 million in total industry output, \$1.53 million in value added economic activity, and will support 24.34 jobs. In this example, total industry output would include the output generated by the supplemental feed industry and those industries that supply it. Value added from this industry includes employee compensation, proprietary income, other proprietor income, and indirect business taxes that are generated.<sup>4</sup> The employment multiplier represents the number of jobs that are supported per million dollar change in final demand.

<sup>2</sup> Lindall, Scott A. and Douglas C. Olson. "The IMPLAN Input-Output System." Minnesota IMPLAN Group. Available online, accessed February 5, 2007. http://www.implan.com/

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

# Table 3: Cervid Industry Multipliers.

/			
	Output	Value Added	Employment
Supplemental Feed	2.67	1.53	24.34
Food plots	3.18	1.72	46.12
Veterinar y	3.43	1.57	31.42
Utilities	2.04	1.23	8.48
Insurance	2.35	1.52	18.25
Maintenance and repair	3.01	1.57	24.68
Handling facility	2.93	1.61	25.61
Fencing	3.02	1.61	25.36
Large equipment	3.02	1.29	15.79
ATV's	2.73	1.59	22.96

# Hunter Expenditures

An additional component in determining the economic impact of the industry is to evaluate and include the role of hunter expenditures in the consumption of industry products. Not all hunting is related to cervid farming, but some is, therefore it is important to include only that which is related to this industry. In other words, the hunting product of cervid farming is a small part of overall cervid hunting in the United States. Yet the hunting component or economic activity associated with deer farming is an important part of the economic activity generated by the cervid farming industry. While overall hunter numbers in the United States are down, the demand for trophy hunting appears to be increasing. Dollars spent on hunting, assorted gear, and travel continue to grow. Time is increasingly the limiting factor for many industry participants, as they have the money to participate, but not the time to invest in traditional hunting. The growth of this segment of the industry is expected to continue, therefore, it is important to include this aspect of the industry in this study.

In order to determine this impact, the number of hunters per operation was taken from the survey, extrapolated against all hunting operations, and combined with a report that outlines hunting expenditures on a per hunter basis. This report, entitled the "Economic Importance of Hunting in America",<sup>5</sup> was based on the 2001 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation survey conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Census Bureau. These retail expenditures were then combined with other hunt related expenditures, such as trophy and processing fees, and assigned sector codes for the IMPLAN model. When totaled, less than 1 percent of the report's estimated 11 million deer hunters are related to the cervid farming industry. However, this small percentage of hunters account for over 2 percent of the report's estimated \$10 billion in retail, travel, and hunt related expenditures.

# Results

Table 4 below provides a summary of the economic impact of the industry. Cervid operations generate an estimated \$893.5 million in direct expenditures into the U.S. economy. This value represents the estimated increase in final demand of all goods and services consumed by the industry. As these direct expenditures ripple throughout the economy, the cervid farming industry generates an estimated \$2.3 billion of total industry output for all industries that supply the cervid farming industry. These industries include feed suppliers, farm and ranch supply stores, veterinary services, medical and sedation product suppliers, construction, utilities, advertising, insurance, and numerous others. Hunters contribute an additional \$241 million in direct economic impacts through retail and hunt related expenditures, which generates a total of \$756.9 million of total industry output.

When combined, the cervid farming industry generates \$3 billion of economic activity and output in the U.S. economy. The industry provides the economic activity that supports 29,199 jobs in the economy, most of which are located in rural areas of the nation. If this industry were to disappear, these jobs would have to find support from some other sector of the economy. Unfortunately, not every segment of the industry could be analyzed. Insufficient industry and survey data limited analysis to only the operational aspects of both the venison and scent collection industries, as production and retail revenues were excluded from the analysis.

<sup>5</sup> "Economic Importance of Hunting in America." Produced by Southwick Associates, Inc. for the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, 2002. Available online, accessed August 10, 2006. <u>http://www.southwickassociates.com/freereports/default.aspx</u>

	Direct	Output	Value Added	Employment
All Operations	893,501,559	2,333,462,511	1,276,311,405	21,070
Hunters	241,042,970	756,897,725	358,602,855	8,129
Total	1,134,544,528	3,090,360,236	1,634,914,260	29,199

# Table 4: Economic Impact of the Cervid Farming Industry.

# Conclusion

With over 7,000 operations and 2,000 hunting preserves, the cervid farming industry has an established presence across the nation. The majority of these operations are located in rural areas of the nation. In addition, while traditional forms overwhelmingly dominate the hunting industry, the small niche of hunters this market serves continues to increase. This increase in demand is fueling the growth in the breeding industry. Over \$1.1 billion in direct expenditures are poured into the U.S. economy each year by commercial farming operations and sportsmen related to this industry. In turn, this generates \$3 billion of economic activity while supporting 29,199 jobs. All told, these results highlight the fact that the cervid farming industry continues to be a vital contributor to the rural economies of the United States.



# Appendix A: National Cervid Industry Survey

Cervid Breeding conti

<i>Please india</i> Cervid Bre	cate type eding	pe of ope (includes	<i>venison</i>	chec and	<i>k all the</i> urine co	<i>arvey</i> at app ollecti	. Inc ply) on) [_	clude	<i>annua</i> rvid H	<i>lized</i> untir	2005 j	figures wl Cervid B	<i>iere appro</i> reeding a	<i>priate</i> . nd Hunting	
Cervid B. Please select	reedi	<b>ng</b> f cervid b	reeding o	opera	tion: I	Breedi	ing on	ily 🗆	Com	nerci	al Ven	ison 🗌 C	ommercia	l Urine Collec	tion 🗌
I. Operation															
1. Year starte	:d:							2. :	State:				_		
3. Total acrea	age:		a	cres				4. /	Area un	der hi	igh fend	:e:		acres	
5. Area of la	nd pure	hased:			acre	s		5a.	Purcha	se valu	ue: \$		(per	acre)	
6. Area of la	nd inhe	rited:			acı	es									
II. Herd Inv	entory														
1. Inventory	(Final 2	2005 figu	res)												
		Whitetail	Elà	-	Mule De	er	Axis		Fallow	Re	d Deer	Reindeer	Sika	Pere David's	Muntjak
Males:				_											
Females:			-	_											
Fawns/calves:				_				-							
Birth rate (2005):															
Birth rate (2006):								_							
Annual mortality rat	e (%):			_				_		_					
			_												
2. Annual Pu	rchases	s (Final 20	005 figur	es)											
	Whi	tetail	Elk	Mu	le Deer	As	cis	Falle	ow	Red Do	eer	Reindeer	Sika	Pere David's	Muntjak
Males (#):															
Total Cost:															
Females (#):															
Total Cost:															
Fawns/calves (#):															
Total Cost:															
Semen straws (#):															
Total Cost:															
<ul> <li>III. Facilitie.</li> <li>1. Area of br</li> <li>2. Area of ve</li> <li>3. Area of ur</li> <li>4. Capital co</li> <li>6. Capital co</li> <li>6. Capital co</li> <li>8. Capital co</li> <li>9. Do you ha</li> <li>10. Do you ha</li> <li>11. Do you ha</li> </ul>	s eeding nison o ine coll st of fer st of im st of wo ve a ha ave a v ave a c	operation operation: lection op ncing: \$ uprovement orking per ndling fac venison pr ooler/free	eration: nts: \$ ns: \$ ccessing zer for v	] Ye facili eniso	a a s [] N ity? [] n? [] '	cres cres acr acr Yes Yes	es — ] No	o	1a. Nu 2a. Ni 3a. Ni 5. Caj 7. Caj 9a. Ii 10a. 1 11a.	imber imber imber oital co oital co oital co oital co f yes, c if yes,	of pen of pen of pen ost of s ost of a capital capital , capita	s: s: helters: \$ dditional b cost of this l cost of thi l cost of thi	uildings: \$_ facility: \$_ s facility: \$ is equipment	- 	
12. Do you h	ave a u	rine colle	ction fac	ility?	🗌 Ye	s 🗌	No		12a.	lf yes,	, capita	l cost of thi	s facility: \$		
13. Do you have a cooler/freezer for urine?       Yes       No       13a. If yes, capital cost of this equipment: \$															

National Cervid Industry - Economic Impact Survey

IV. Equips 1. Purchase	nent price of all la	arge equipmer	it, combined (	i.e. tractor	+ bobcat): \$					
2. Purchase	2. Purchase price of all ATVs, combined: \$									
3. Purchase price of all ranch vehicles, combined: \$										
4. Purchase	4. Purchase price of all implements, combined: \$									
5. Purchase	price of all t	railers/transpo	rt crates, com	bined: \$						
6. Purchase	6 Purchase price of all bulk feed hins, combined: \$									
7. Purchase	7. Purchase price of all feeding equipment, combined: \$									
8. Purchase price of all watering equipment, combined \$										
9. Purchase	9 Purchase price of all video equipment, combined: \$									
10. Annual	cost of rental	equipment: \$				-				
11. Purchas	se price of ser	nen storage tar	nk(s): \$							
12. Purchas	se price of dar	rt gun/sedation	equipment: 5	6						
13. Purchas	se price of pac	ckaging equip	nent (venison	and urine	products): \$					
V. Veterina	urv & Supplie	5								
1. Annual o	ost of operati	ing supplies: \$			2. A	nnual cost of	f medical sur	oplies: S		
3. Annual v	3 Annual veterinary expense: \$ 4 An							s		
5. Number of necronsies performed: 5a. Average cost per actanon. 5										
6. Number of CWD tests performed: 6a. Average cost per CWD test* \$										
7. Number	7 Number of deer DNA certified: 7a Annual cost for DNA certification \$									-
8 Average	A variage appual number of sedetions (par animal per spacias):									
	Whitetail	Elk	Mule Deer	Axis	Fallow	Red Deer	Reindeer	Sika	Pere David's	Muntjak
Males:										
Females:										
9. Annual r	number of fen	nales Al'd (per	species):		F.0	5.15	n : 1	01	5 5 10	N
	whitetaii	EIK	Mule Deer	AXIS	Fanow	Red Deer	Reindeer	Sika	Pere David s	Muntjak
Females AI'd:										
VI. Labor 1 Number	of employees	: la Pai	d salary:			1b Paid b	ourly.			
2. Total an	nual wages pa	uid: 2a Sal	aries: \$			2b Hourly	v: \$			
3 Annual a	xnense from	outsourced set	vices: \$			20. 110411				
VII. Utiliti	es									
1. Annual o	cost of utilities	s: \$								
2. Annual o	cost of fuel: \$									
VIII. Misc	ellaneous Exp	penses								
1. Annual a	dvertising/ma	arketing expen	se (includes t	axidermy s	ervices): \$					
2. Annual r	egulatory exp	ense (permits)	): \$							
3. Annual 1	neat inspectio	on/nutrition lab	eling expense	e: \$						
4. Annual i	nsurance exp	ense: \$								
5. Annual t	ravel expense	:: S								
6. Annual p	roperty tax: \$	5								
7. Annual o	ost of mainte	nance and rep	air: \$							

in. reeuing												
Fawns/Calves		_			_							
<ol> <li>Do you bottle</li> </ol>	feed?	Yes	(continu	ie below)		No (skip	to 2)					
		Whitetail	Elk	Mule De	er	Axis	Fallow	Red De	er Reinde	er Sika	a Pere David's	Muntja
Percent of all fawns/cab	/es:											
Days fed until weaning:												
Product used:												
Product price per gal/ba	g/Ib:											
Units fed until weaning:												
2. After weaning	g: (unit	is are pou	ınds per	animal)								
	Whi	tetail	Elk	Mule Deer	A	xis	Fallow	Red Deer	Reindeer	Sika	Pere David's	Muntja
Daily protein feed rate:												
Daily hay feed rate:												
	_								1		1 1	
Adults												
<ol> <li>Feeding rates</li> </ol>	: (units	are pour	nds per a	nimal)								
	Whi	tetail	Elk	Mule Deer	A	xis	Fallow	Red Deer	Reindeer	Sika	Pere David's	Muntja
Males:												
Daily protein feed rate:												
Daily hay feed rate:												
Females:												
Daily feed rate:												
Daily hay feed rate:												
									1			
<ol><li>Protein feed p</li></ol>	rice: \$			_ (per bag/to	on)							
3. Hay price: \$			(p	er bale)				3a. Ave	rage bale we	ight:	lbs	
4. Annual protei	n feed	purchase	:			tons						
5. Annual hay p	urchase	:		t	ales							
6. Approximate	area of	food plo	ts:		a	cres						
6a. Ani	ual co	st of seed	I: \$									
6b. An	nual co	st of ferti	ilizer: \$		_							
X. Annual Sale:	5		_									
Annual receipt	s from	breeding	g operat	ion								
	White	rtail	Elk	Mule Deer	1	Axis	Fallow	Red Deer	Reindeer	Sika	Pere David's	Muntjal
1. Males sold:					-				1			
la. Total Receipts:									1			
2. Females sold:					-				+			
2a Total Receipte									<u> </u>			
20. Total Receipts:					_			1	1			
3. Fawns/calves sold:												
3a. Total Receipts:												
4. Semen straws sold:										_		
4a. Total Receipts:					1			1				

### Cervid Breeding, continued Annual receipts from commercial venison production Eli Annual number processed ing yield per anima ng cost per animal Sp. A animal (lbs): 6. Total receipts from all venison sales: 7. Annual packaging, shipping, and labeling expense for venison: \$ 8. Annual number of animals used to collect velvet: 9. Annual amount of velvet processed: lbs (per pound) 10. Processing cost of velvet: \$ 11. Total receipts from velvet products: \$ 12. Annual packaging, shipping, and labeling expense for velvet products: \$\_\_\_\_\_ 13. Annual amount of shed/cut antlers sold: \_\_\_\_\_ lbs 13a. Total receipts from antler sales: \$ 14. Total receipts from other by-products (hides, pizzles, etc.): \$\_\_\_\_\_ 15. Annual number of males sold as breeding stock: 15a. Total receipts: \$ 16. Annual number of females sold as breeding stock: 16a. Total receipts: \$\_\_\_\_\_ 17. Annual number of males sold to hunting preserves: 17a. Total receipts: \$\_ 18. Annual number of females sold to hunting preserves: 18a. Total receipts: \$ Annual receipts from urine collection 1. Total number of males used for collection: 2. Annual amount of urine collected from males: gal 2a. Total receipts from male urine sales: \$\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Total number of females used for collection: 4. Annual amount of non-estrous urine collected from females: gal 4a. Total receipts from non-estrous urine sales: \$\_\_\_\_ 5. Annual amount of estrous urine collected from females: \_\_\_\_\_ gal 5a. Total receipts from estrous urine sales: \$ 6. Annual packaging, shipping, and labeling expense for urine sales: \$\_\_\_\_\_ 7. Total receipts from other scent sales: \$\_\_\_\_\_ 8. Annual number of males sold as breeding stock: 8a. Total receipts: \$\_ 9. Annual number of females sold as breeding stock: 9a. Total receipts: \$

Annual number of iterates sout as treecuing stock. \_\_\_\_\_\_ 52. total receipts. \$
 10. Annual number of males solt on hunting preserves: \_\_\_\_\_\_ 10. Total receipts: \$
 11. Annual number of females solt to hunting preserves: \_\_\_\_\_\_ 11. Total receipts: \$

# **APPENDIX**

### Hunting

What is the purpose of your hunting operation?	Personal use only	Corporate clients, no fee	Paying clients
I. Operation			
1. Year started:	2. Sta		
3. Total acreage: acres	4. La	nd inherited:	acres
5. Land purchased:acres	5a. Pi	irchase value: \$	(per acre)
6. Area of hunting operation:	acres		
II. Facilities			
1. Capital cost of lodge(s): \$			
2. Capital cost of fencing: \$	-		
3. Capital cost of improvements: \$			
4. Capital cost of buildings: §	_		
5. Approximate area of food plots:	acres		
5a. Annual cost of seed: \$			
5b. Annual cost of fertilizer: \$			
III. Equipment			
1. Purchase price of all large equipment combine	ed (i.e. tractor + bobcat)	: \$	
<ol><li>Purchase price of all ATVs, combined: \$</li></ol>			
3. Purchase price of all ranch vehicles, combined	i: \$		
<ol><li>Purchase price of all implements, combined: §</li></ol>	š	-	
5. Purchase price of all trailers/transport crates, of	combined: \$		
6. Purchase price of all bulk feed bins, combined	i: \$	_	
7. Purchase price of all feeding equipment, comb	pined: \$		
8. Purchase price of all watering equipment, con	nbined: \$		
9. Purchase price of all video equipment, combin	ned: \$		
10. Annual cost of rental equipment: \$			
11. Purchase price of cooler/freezer equipment: 5	s		
12. Purchase price of other equipment: \$			
IV. Supplies			
1. Annual amount of protein feed purchased:	tons 1a	a. Protein feed unit price: \$	(per bag/tor
2. Annual amount of corn purchased:	tons 2a	. Corn unit price: \$	(per bag/ton)
3. Annual cost of operating supplies for lodge: \$			
4. Annual cost of food and beverages for lodge:	s		
V. Labor			
V. Labor 1. Number of employees: 1a. Salary:		1b. Hourly:	

Hunting, contin	ued									
VI. Utilities 1. Annual cost of ut	ilities: \$									
2. Annual cost of fu	el: \$									
VII. Miscellaneous	Expenses									
1 Annual insurance	expense: \$									
2 Annual advantiair	a/montrating		aludaa tawida		-). F					
2. Annual advertisii	ig/marketing (	expense (in	ciudes taxidei	my service	s). s					
<ol> <li>Annuai travei exp</li> </ol>	enses: 5									
4. Annual property	ax: \$		_							
5. Annual cost of m	aintenance an	d repair: \$_			-					
<ol><li>Other annual mis</li></ol>	cellaneous ex	penses: \$								
VIII. Hunters										
	Whitetail	Elk	Mule Deer	Axis	Fallow	Red Deer	Reindeer	Sika	Pere David's	Muntjak
Annual number of hunters,										
per cervid:						1				
Total cervids in hunting										
area :										
Percentage of total cervids										
that are from breeding:										
from broading area into										
hunting area:										
Number of females										
released from breeding										
area into hunting area:										
Number of males										
purchased for release into										
hunting area:										
Total expense:										
Number of females										
purchased for release into										
hunting area:										
Total expense:										
Annual trophy male										
harvest:										
Total receipts:										
Annual management male	İ									
harvest:			L							
1 otal receipts:										
Annual female harvest:										
Total receipts:										
Average processing cost,										
per cervid:										
Percent of all harvested										
mases seeking taxidermy										
Average taxidermy cost:										
							-			

### National Cervid Industry - Economic Impact Survey North American Deer Farmers Association Members

### \*\*All information collected in this survey will remain <u>confidential</u>\*

### Survey Instructions

- This survey is to be completed by cervid breeding operations (including venison production and urine collection operations), combination cervid breeding and hunting operations, and hunting operations that utilize outside cervid breeding operations as a genetic supplement for their cervid herd. All other industry participants may divergent drive units of the supplement for their cervid herd. disregard this survey
- unregard unis survey. For the sections and categories below, please provide annualized 2005 records of actual or accurate estimates of expenditures rather than a range estimate of expenditures. For combination breeding and hunting operations, please separate breeding operation records from hunting operation records. Contact us for additional surveys if you have multiple permitted breeding and the operation records. 3.
- and/or hunting operations.
- and/or numming operations. It is important to use the provided categories for records for each section, rather than combining records from breeding and hunting operations and submitting that in a breeding or hunting category. Please 4. I would be course and mostly give also you and southatting that the discussion of the provide an accurate estimating to provide an accurate estimation of the provide and the second provide the second pro
- For further explanation of general and selected lines of the survey, please refer to the information below

### Cervid Breeding (Breeding only, Venison production, Urine Collection)

### Please indicate the purpose of your breeding operation by checking all boxes that apply.

I. Operation: This category provides for a general overview of your operation. Purchase value refers to the cost per acre for the initial purchase of the land.

II. Herd Inventory: This category refers to your final 2005 cervid inventory and final 2005 purchases (please include The theorem and the second sec females (i.e. 1.5, 2.3, etc.).

III. Facilities: This category refers to your operational specific facilities. Capital cost refers to the overall cost of construction for each of the items listed, including clearing, foundation, electrical, plumbing, etc. Capital cost of improvements refers to land clearing, roads, forage, water (well drilling, ponds), etc.

IV. Equipment: Purchase price refers to the original cost of the equipment at purchase, not an annualized loan payment. Large equipment refers to tractors, bobcats, dozers, etc., used in your operation. Please combine all applicable equipment into one figure for lines 1-9.

V. Veteriarv & Supplies: Annual cost of operating supplies refers to the yearly expense for all operating supplies, such as office supplies, sedation supplies, Al supplies, etc. Annual cost of medical supplies refers to the yearly expense for medicine, syringes, etc. Average cost per sedation refers to the average expense of supplies and labor to sedate or dart an animal. Number of necropsise performed refers to the number of post mortality veterinary examinations performed to determine the cause of death. Average cost per necropsy refers to the average labor and labwork expense of performing a necropsy on a single animal. Average cost per CWD test refers to the average labor and labwork expense of performing a CWD test.

<u>VI. Labor</u>: This category refers to the labor expense for your breeding operation. Owners, spouses, and children must be accounted for in this category as an employee(s) and in total wages, if paid labor is performed by these individuals. *Total wages paid* refers to annual wages for all employees. Owner/operators must include amount allotted or withfrawn for family living for line 2.a. *Annual corpense from outsourced services* refers to all additional contracted labor from those not on the payroll, including consulting services, accounting services, legal services, herd survey services, etc.

<u>VII. Utilities</u>: This category refers to the annual utilities expense for electric, phone, water, sewage, refuse disposal, etc., and the annual fuel expense for your breeding operation.

VIII. Miscellaneous Expenses: Annual advertising/marketing expense refers to the annual cost of advertising and VIII. Miscellaneous Expenses: Annual divertising/marketing expense refers to the annual cost of advertising and marketing m

**Instance of the set of the se** 

X. Annual Sales: This category relates to the final 2005 revenue inflows of your operation. Receipts are categorized for breeding operations, commercial venison operations, and commercial urine operations. Please separate records for each these categories that apply to your operation.

### Cervid Hunting

Please indicate the purpose of your hunting operation by checking all boxes that apply <u>I. Operation</u>: Area of hunting operation refers to the total acreage dedicated to your hunting operation. Purchase value refers to the cost per acre for the initial purchase of the land.

II. Facilities: Capital cost refers to the overall cost of construction for each of the items listed, including clearing, electrical, plumbing, etc. Capital cost of improvements refers to land clearing, roads, forage, water (well drilling, ponds), etc.

III. Equipment: Purchase price refers to the original cost of the equipment at purchase, not an annualized loan payment. Large equipment refers to tractors, bobcats, dozers, etc., used in your breeding operation. Please combine all applicable equipment into one figure for lines 1-9.

IV. Supplies: This category relates to final 2005 expenses for supplemental feed, corn, operating, and food and beverage upplies

Supprior 2, Labor: This category refers to the labor expense for your hunting operation. Owners, spouses, and children must be accounted for in this category as an employee(s) and in total wages, if paid labor is performed by these individuals. *Total wages paid* refers to annual wages for all employees. Owner/operators must include amount allotted or withfrawn for family living for line 2a. *Annual vegenses for autowarde services* refers to all additional contracted labor from those not on the payroll, including consulting services, accounting services, legal services, herd survey services, etc.

VI. Utilities: This category refers to the annual utilities expense for electric, phone, water, sewage, refuse disposal, etc., and the annual fuel expense for your hunting operation.

<u>VII. Miscellancous Expenses</u>. Annual insurance expense refers to the yearly cost of auto, property, liability, health, etc. insurance. Annual advertising/marketing expense refers to the annual cost of advertising and marketing materials, which includes taxidemy services for display. Annual inravel expense refers to the annual cost of travel; such as fuel, food, logging, airfare, etc. Annual cost of maintenance and repair refers to a limitenance and repair for facilities, equipment, fnering, roads, etc.

<u>VIII. Hunters:</u> Total expense refers to the cost of purchasing, sedating, and transporting cervids for release into hunting operation. Average processing cost refers to the cost of processing each harvested cervid. If in-house processing occurs, please provide an accurate estimate of this cost based on local processor costs. Percent of all harvested seeking taxidermy services relates to the percentage of all harvested cervids that will have some type of taxidermy services processing entrance processing exact and a shoulder or full body mount. Average taxidermy cost, per cervid allows for the average per cervid expense of this services relates the processing to the percentage of all harvested cervid. service for the hunter from your local taxidermist

We thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. Upon completion, please return the survey with the enclosed envelope. Questions or requests for additional surveys may be directed to Brian Frosch at 888-890-5663.

# Appendix B: Economic Impact Survey

Economic Impact Survey							
Please indicate type of operation     Scientific Breeding and Hunting     Hunting only       Scientific Breeding and Hunting     Hunting only     Image: Scientific Breeding and Hunting							
Scientific Breeding Instructions and clarification are provided at the end of this surveys. For <u>Hunting only</u> operations, please skip to the hunting section. Include annualized 2005 figures where appropriate.							
I. Operation							
3 Land nurchased: (acres) 3a Purchase value: \$ (ner acre)							
4. Land inherited:	(acres)		( , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
II. Herd Inventory (Fin	al 2005 Inventory)						
1. Total number of deer:							
2. Number of breeder bu	cks: 3. Numb	er of stocker bucks:	4. Does:				
5. Fawns, 2005:	5a. Faw	ning rate (surviving at weaning):	(fawns per doe)				
6. Fawns, 2006:	6a. Faw	ning rate (surviving at weaning):	(fawns per doe)				
7. Annual herd mortality	rate (including fawns after weaning	g):%					
8. Annual sales (Final 2	005 figures)	9. Annual purchases (Fina	al 2005 figures)				
Breeder bucks (#):	Total receipts: \$	Breeder bucks (#):	Total cost: \$				
Stocker bucks (#):	Total receipts: \$	Open does (#):	Total cost: \$				
Open does (#):	Total receipts: \$	Bred does (#):	Total cost: \$				
Bred does (#):	Total receipts: \$	Buck fawns (#):	Total cost: \$				
Buck fawns (#):	Total receipts: \$	Doe fawns (#):	Total cost: \$				
Doe fawns (#):	Total receipts: \$	Semen Straws (#):	Total cost: \$				
Semen Straws (#):	Total receipts: \$		1				
III. Facilities							
1. Number of pens:		2. Area of pens:	(acres)				
3. Capital cost of fencing	g: \$	4. Capital cost of shelters:	s				
5. Capital cost of improv	/ements: \$	-					
6. Capital cost of buildir	igs: \$	7. Capital cost of working	pens: S				
8. Do you have a handlin	ng facility? 🗌 Yes 🗌 No	8a. If yes, capital cost of h	andling facility: \$				
9. Approximate area of f	food plots:(acres)						
9a. Annual cost	of seed: \$						
9b. Annual cost	t of fertilizer: §						
10. Annual cost of maintenance and repair: \$							
IV. Equipment							
1. Purchase price of all l	arge equipment, combined (i.e. trac	tor + bobcat): \$					
2. Purchase price of all /	ATV(s), combined: \$						
3. Purchase price of all r	anch vehicle(s), combined: \$						
4. Purchase price of all i	mplements, combined: \$						
5. Purchase price of all t	railer(s)/transport crate(s), combine	d: \$					
<ol><li>Purchase price of all b</li></ol>	ulk feed bin(s), combined: \$						
7. Purchase price of all feeding equipment, combined: \$							

Scientific Breeding, continued	
8. Purchase price of all watering equipment, combined: \$	
9. Purchase price of all video equipment, combined: \$	
10. Annual cost of rental equipment: \$	
11. Purchase price of semen storage tank(s): \$	_
12. Purchase price of dart gun/sedation equipment: \$	
V. Veterinary & Supplies	
1. Annual cost of operating supplies: \$	2. Annual cost of feed and hay: \$
3. Annual cost of medical supplies: \$	4. Annual veterinary expense: \$
5. Annual number of sedations: (per doe)	6. Annual number of sedations: (per buck)
7. Average cost per sedation: \$	8. Number of does AI'd:
9. Number of necropsies performed:	9a. Average cost per necropsy: \$
10. Number of CWD tests performed:	10a. Average cost per CWD test: \$
11. Number of deer DNA certified:	11a. Annual cost for DNA certification: \$
VI. Labor	
1. Number of employees: 1a. Paid salary:	1b. Paid hourly:
2. Total wages paid: 2a. Salaries: \$	2b. Hourly: \$
3. Annual expense from outsourced services: \$	
VII. Utilities	
1. Annual cost of utilities: \$	
2. Annual cost of fuel: \$	
VIII. Miscellaneous Expenses	
1. Annual insurance expense: \$	
2. Annual advertising/marketing expense (includes taxidermy servi	ces): \$
3. Annual travel expense: \$	
4. Annual property tax: \$	
IX. Feeding	
Fawns 1 Do you bottle feed your fawns? Ves (continue with 1a-1e)	No (skin to 2)
1a If yes what nercent of all fawms? %	the Average bottle feeding days until weaping:
1c What product do you use?	10. Herdage boute recarding days and weating.
1d Units fed per fawn until weaning: (gal/ba	uss/lbs) 1e Product price: \$ (per gal/bag/lb)
2. After weaning: 2a. Approximate daily feed rate: (	lbs per fawn) 2b. Feed price: \$ (per bag/ton)
2c Approximate alfalfa/bay daily feed rate: (lbs	per fawn) 2d Alfalfa/hay price: \$ (per bale)
2e. Average bale weight: Ibs	1
Does	
1. Approximate daily feed rate: (lbs per doe)	2. Feed price: \$ (per bag/ton)
3. Approximate alfalfa/hay daily feed rate: (lbs	per doe)
Bucks	
1. Approximate daily feed rate: (lbs per buc	<li>x) 2. Feed price: \$ (per bag/ton)</li>
3. Approximate alfalfa/hay daily feed rate: (II	os per buck)

## Hunting

Instructions and clarification are provided at the end of this survey. For combination <u>Scientific Breeding &amp; Hunting operations</u> , please separate hunting expenses from breeding expenses. Include annualized 2005 figures where appropriate.		
What is the purpose of your hunting operation? Personal use only Corporate clients, no fee Paying clients		
I. Operation           1. Year started:           2. J	Area of hunting operation:	(acres)
3. Land purchased: (acres) 3a.	Purchase value: \$	(per acre)
4. Land inherited: (acres)		
II. Facilities		
1. Capital cost of lodge(s): \$		
2. Capital cost of fencing: \$		
3. Capital cost of improvements: §		
4. Capital cost of buildings: \$		
5. Annual cost of maintenance and repair: \$		
6. Approximate area of food plots: (acres)		
6a. Annual cost of seed: \$		
6b. Annual cost of fertilizer: \$		
III. Equipment		
1. Purchase price of all large equipment combined (i.e. tractor + bob	ocat): \$	
2. Purchase price of all ATV(s), combined: \$		
3. Purchase price of all ranch vehicle(s), combined: \$		
4. Purchase price of all implements, combined: \$		
5. Purchase price of all trailer(s)/transport crate(s), combined: \$		
6. Purchase price of all bulk feed bin(s), combined: \$		
7. Purchase price of all feeding equipment, combined: \$		
8. Purchase price of all watering equipment, combined: \$		
9. Purchase price of all video equipment, combined: \$		
10. Annual cost of rental equipment: \$		
11. Purchase price of dart gun/sedation equipment: \$		
12. Purchase price of cooler/freezer equipment: \$		
13. Purchase price of other equipment: \$		
IV. Supplies		
1. Annual amount of protein feed purchased: (tons)	1a. Protein feed unit price: \$	(per bag/ton)
2. Annual amount of corn purchased: (tons)	2a. Corn unit price: \$	(per bag/ton)
3. Annual cost of operating supplies for lodge: \$		
4. Annual cost of food and beverages for lodge: \$		
V. Labor		
1. Number of employees: 1a. Salary:	1b. Hourly:	
2. Total wages paid: 2a. Salaries: \$	2b. Hourly: \$	
3. Annual expense from outsourced services: \$		

### VI. Utilities 1. Annual cost of utilities: \$\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Annual cost of fuel: \$ VII. Miscellaneous Expenses 1. Annual insurance expense: \$\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Annual advertising/marketing expense (includes taxidermy services): \$\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Annual travel expenses: \$\_\_\_\_\_

Hunting, continued

4. Annual property tax: \$\_\_\_\_ 5. Other annual miscellaneous expenses: \$\_\_\_\_ VIII. Hunters 1. Annual number of hunters: 2. Total annual deer harvest: 3. Approximate total number of deer in hunting area: 3a. Approximate percentage of total deer in the hunting area that are from breeding: 4. Annual number of stocker bucks released from breeding operation into hunting operation: 5. Annual number of does released from breeding operation into hunting operation: 6. Annual number of stocker bucks purchased for release into hunting operation: 6a. Total expense: \$\_\_\_\_ 7. Annual number of does purchased for release: 7a. Total expense: \$\_\_\_\_ 8. Annual number of does harvested: 8a. Total receipts from doe hunts: \$\_\_\_\_\_ 9. Annual number of management bucks harvested: 9a. Total receipts from management buck hunts: \$\_ 10. Annual number of trophy bucks harvested: \_\_\_\_\_\_ 10a. Total receipts from trophy buck hunts: \$\_\_\_\_ 12 \_%

Average processing cost:      S	(per deer)
2. Approximate percentage of harves	sted bucks seeking taxidermy services:
3. Average taxidermy cost: \$	(per deer)

**APPENDIX** 

### **Economic Impact Survey** Texas Deer Association Members

### \*\*All information collected in this survey will remain <u>confidential</u>\*\*

### Survey Instructions

- This survey is to be completed by scientific breeding operations, combination scientific breeding and hunting operations, and hunting operations, and hunting operations, and hunting operations, and hunting operations and categories below, please provide annualized 2005 records of actual or accurate estimates of expenditures rather than a range estimate of expenditures. For these scions and categories facilities under separate permits (uniquely identified), please contact us for additional surveys for each operation. It is important to separate records for each facility, and between hunting and breeding operations. For this scholary site of the provide denualized for each additional surveys for goal the provide categories for records for accurate combining records from abreeding and hunting operations and submitting that in a breeding relatory. Please provide an accurate estimate when purficues and untertogores. If a question does not apply to your operation, please indicate this with an "N/A" response. Please invite units (black and please indicate this with an "N/A" response.
- Please indicate units (lbs, tons, gals, etc.) where applicable. For further explanation of general and selected lines of the survey, please refer to the information below

### Scientific Breeding

LOperation: Area of breeding operation refers to the total acreage dedicated to your breeding operation. Purchase value refers to the cost per acre for the initial purchase of the land.

I. Herd Inventory: This category refers to your herd inventory, fawing rate, purchases and sales towards your inventory for 2005, and number the of fawns born and fawning rate for 2006. Annual herd mortality rate refers to the annual mortality loss on the total breeding herd, including loss of fawns after weaning. Fawning rate refers to the number of surviving fawns born gene expectically, the total number of live fawns at weaning divided by the total number of bred does (i.e. 0.7, 1.5, 2.3, etc.).

III. Facilitie: Area of pens refers to the total acreage enclosed by all pens combined. Capital cost refers to the overall cost of construction for each of the items listed, including clearing, foundation, electrical, plumbing, etc. Capital cost of improvements refers to had clearing, roads, forge, water (well drilling, ponds), etc. Annual cost of maintenance and repair refers to all maintenance and repair for facilities, equipment, fencing, roads, etc.

IV. Equipment: Purchase price refers to the original cost of the equipment at purchase, not an annualized loan payment. Large equipment refers to tractors, bobcast, dozers, etc., used in your breeding operation. Please combine all applicable equipment into one figure for lines 1-9.

V\_Veteriarve & Supplies. Annual cost of operating supplies refers to the yearly expense for all operating supplies, such as office supplies, sedation supplies, AI supplies, etc. Annual cost of medical supplies refers to the yearly expense for medicine, syringes, etc. Annual number of sedations refers to the average annual number of sedations on a per doe/buck basis. Average cost per sedadion refers to the average expense of supplies and labor to sedate or dart a deer. Number of necropsize performed refers to the number of post mortality veterinary examinations performed to determine the cause of death. Average cost per necropsy refers to the average labor and habwork expense of performing an necropsy on a single deer. Average cost per CWD test refers to the average labor and labwork expense of performing a CWD test.

VI. Labor: This category refers to the labor evenese for your breeding operation. Owners, spouses, and children must be accounted for in this category as an employee(s) and in total wages, if labor is performed by these individuals. *Total wages pidl* refers to annual wages for all employees. Owner/operators must include amount allotted or withdrawn for family living for line 2.a. *Annual corense from outsourced services* refers to all additional contracted labor from those not on the payroll, including consulting services, accounting services, legal services, herd survey services, etc.

VII. Utilities: This category refers to the annual utilities expense for the annual electric, phone, water, sewage, refuse disposal, etc., and the annual fuel expense for breeding operations.

<u>VIII. Miscellaneous Expenses</u>: Annual insurance expense refers to the yearly cost of auto, property, liability, health, etc. insurance. Annual advertising/marketing expense refers to the annual cost of advertising and marketing materials, which includes taxidemy services for genetic display (hom molds or shed mounts, or deceased buck mounts). Annual travel expense refers to the annual cost of travel, such as fuel, food, lodging, airfare, etc.

IX. Feeding: This category relates to feeding rates for fawns, bucks, and does. For those who bottle feed fawns, please indicate the percent of all fawns that are bottle feed, number of days of bottle feeding until weaning, the product used (i.e. goat milk, milk replacer, etc.), units of this product used per fawn until weaning, the per unit product price (please indicate units-gal, bags, lbs).

### Hunting

I. Operation: Area of hunting operation refers to the total acreage dedicated to your hunting operation. Purchase value refers to the cost per acre for the initial purchase of the land.

II. Facilities: Capital cost refers to the overall cost of construction for each of the items listed, including clearing, foundation, electrical, plumbing, etc. Capital cost of improvements refers to land clearing, roads, forage, water (well drilling, ponds), etc. Annual cost of maintenance and repair refers to all maintenance and repair for facilities, equipment, fencin roads, etc.

III. Equipment: Purchase price refers to the original cost of the equipment at purchase, not an annualized loan payment. Large equipment refers to tractors, bobcats, dozers, etc., used in your breeding operation. Please combine all applicable equipment into on figure for lines 1-9.

IV. Supplies: This category relates to supplemental feed, corn, operating, food, and beverage supplies for hunting operations on an annualized basis.

<u>V. Labor</u>: This category refers to the labor expense for your breeding operation. Owners, spouses, and children must be accounted for in this category as an employee(s) and in total wages, if labor is performed by these individuals. *Total wages paid* refers to annual wages for all employees. Owner/operators must include amount allotted or withdrawn for family living for line 2a. *Annual expense for outsourced services* refers to all additional contracted labor from those not on the payroll, including consulting services, accounting services, legal services, herd survey services, etc.

VI. Utilities: This category refers to the annual utilities expense for the annual electric, phone, water, sewage, refuse disposal, etc., and the annual fuel expense for hunting operations.

<u>VII. Miscellaneous Expenses</u>: Annual insurance expense refers to the yearly cost of auto, property, liability, health, etc. insurance. Annual advertising/marketing expense refers to the annual cost of advertising and marketing materials, which includes taxidenny services for display. Annual travel expense refers to the annual cost of travel, such as fuel, food, lodging, airfare, etc.

VIII. Hunters: This category relates to the annual number of hunters, number of deer harvested, number of deer purchased and/or released into hunting operation, and the expenses and receipts from hunting. *Total expenses* inlines 6a & 7a refer to the cost of purchasing, sedating, and transporting deer for release into hunting operation. *Average processing* cost refers to the cost of purcessing each harvested deer. If it is processed in-house, please provide an accurate estimate of this cost from based on local processing each harvested deer. If it is processed in-house, please provide an accurate estimate of this cost from based on local processor costs. Line 12 relates to the percentage of harvested deer that will have some type of taxidemy service performed, such as a shoulder or full body mount. Line 13 allows for the average per deer expense of this service for the hunter.

We thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. Upon completion, please return the survey with the enclosed envelope no later than November 10<sup>th</sup>. Questions or requests for additional surveys may also be directed to Brinn Frosh at 888-890-5663.

