

Cynthia M. Hogan
P.O. Box 4015
Salem, Oregon 97302
503.559.6930
cindyhogan@hotmail.com

MEASURE: 37 HB 4158
EXHIBIT: 37
2012 SPECIAL SESSION H AG & NAT RES.
DATE: 2/9/2012 PAGES: 21
SUBMITTED BY: Cynthia Hogan

11 February 2012

Senator Jackie Dingfelder
Chair, Senate Environmental and Natural Resources Committee
Oregon Senate
900 Court Street NE, S-407
Salem, Oregon 97301

Re: HB 4158 the wolf killing bill

Dear Senator Dingfelder,

I write to oppose HB 4158, the wolf killing bill, which would allow the ODFW to circumvent endangered species protection for wolves. Unfortunately, Representative Clem has been touting it as a 'done deal' and told the Cattlemen's Association *before the hearings on the bill* that it would pass the House. (Capital Press report, www.capitalpress.com/oregon/ml-Clem-talk-021012-art) This smacks of an unsavory sort of "fix" in which environmental and economic considerations are ignored. I hope the Senate will seriously consider the economic and environmental facts and will reject the bill.

The bill is a waste of taxpayer dollars. Economically, the legislative hearings and rulemaking procedures cost money. The cattlemen are asking you to go through all this work - not to mention enforcement duties - for a loss of about 20 cattle a year to date. The cattlemen in Oregon lose in excess of 50,000 (fifty thousand) cattle a year to non-wolf causes including disease, weather, theft and the like. This figure comes from the federal National Agricultural Statistics Service in its May 12, 2011 report. I attach a copy for your perusal.

HB 4158 makes a mountain out of a molehill at a time when we have so little money to waste on such folly. Cattlemen are known for their lack of business motivation for the resources they continually seek at public expense. Torell, L.A. and S.A. Bailey, 2000. "Is the profit motive an important determinant of grazing land use and rancher motive?", Western Agric. Econ. Assoc. Annual Mtg.; June 29 - July 1, 2000; Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, 26 pages; Torell, L.A., N. R. Rimbey, J.A. Tanaka, S.A. Bailey, 2001. "The lack of profit motive for ranching: implications for policy analysts. Proc. Current Issues in Rangeland Resources Economics Symposium Western Reg. Coord. Comm. On Rangeland Economics WCC-55. New Mexico State University Res. Rep. Ser. 737. New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM. 12 pages. Twenty cows a year is not an economic threat to ranching. I hope that the Senate would be more careful with public money than the cattlemen are.

My second reason for asking you to oppose this bill is environmental. Based on the studies from Yellowstone, where wolves were re-introduced, the ecosystems benefitted greatly from their presence. The streams became healthier and their native vegetation rebounded because the wolves kept the grazing animals from overgrazing the stream banks. This is just one example.

Wolves also kept the number of diseased animals low which prevents such diseases from spreading rapidly. It may be that some of the cattle lost to the wolves were weak or diseased and would have died anyway. Some of the studies and reviews that show the benefits of wolves are listed at the end of this letter.

Most of the ranches exist on a form of government handout, such as BLM permits. Grazing of cattle on public land is a heavily taxpayer subsidized handout to the cattlemen who do not pay for the damaged rangeland their cattle causes. Where ever the cattle graze the streams are degraded, the native vegetation is lost and the native fauna disappear. A few years ago I took a trip in eastern Oregon through the high desert and in the Steens. I had hoped to see pristine natural areas and pronghorn in the sage. I saw nothing but cattle and extreme damage to the soil and stream sides. Wildflowers were trampled and native vegetation was severely damaged. The state and federal governments have to pay millions to restore these areas. The ranches are so heavily subsidized that the ranchers should not complain when the public good demands the sacrifice of a few cattle each year. If the cattlemen had to pay their way fairly, their 'businesses' would be so unprofitable that they would be bankrupt and we would have no anti-wolf bill.

The overgrazing of public lands also has an impact far afield from the ranges. The fishermen lose out when the salmon streams are degraded. The farmers lose out from the 'dust' and soil erosion caused by overgrazing.

These wild areas have an environmental and economic benefit of their own if they are left in a healthy, intact state. They provide a kind of "bank account" for the future by preserving healthy areas to mitigate the damage caused development in more populated areas. This bank account preserves biodiversity and soils, maintains flood control and in forested areas protects water and air quality. These have substantial economic benefits to the rest of society that far, far outweigh the imagined economic loss to the cattlemen.

The cattlemen's bill has no basis in real world economics so there is no cost/benefit analysis to be done. The cattlemen's fears appear to be based on old myths about wolves tinged with a semi-religious association of the wolf with evil. The ranchers protect their way of life in spite of economics, good sense and biological fact. I come from an old western family and I love the heritage of the west. But ranching should not hang on at a loss to the taxpayers and substantial loss to the environment. The benefit of the wolves to the environment is great; sadly, the benefit of ranching to the taxpayer and to the environment is negative. This negativity should not be compounded by the anti wolf bill. HB 4158 is an insult to good sense and the legislative process - please do not let this bill pass.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,


Cynthia M. Hogan

Attch.

A sample of relevant studies:

- Belsky, A. J., A. Matzke, S. Uselman, 1999. Survey of livestock influences on stream and riparian ecosystems in the western United States. *J. Soil and Water Conserv.* 54 (1): 419-431.
- Beschta, R., and W.J. Ripple, "Are Wolves saving Yellowstone's aspen? A landscape-level test of a behaviorally mediated trophic cascade - Comment," *Ecology* [doi:10.1890/11-0063.1] 2011
- Beschta, R., and W.J. Ripple. "Recovering Riparian Plant Communities with Wolves in Northern Yellowstone, USA." *Restoration Ecology* 18(3), 2010: 380-389.
- Beschta, R., and W.J. Ripple. "Rapid Assessment of Riparian Cottonwood Recruitment: Middle Fork John Day River, Northeastern Oregon." *Ecological Restoration* 23 (3), 2005: 150-156.
- Donahue, D. 1999. *The Western Range Revisited: Removing Livestock from Public Lands to Conserve Biological Diversity*. Univ Oklahoma Press, Norman, OK.
- Estes, J.A, J. Terborgh, J.S. Brashares, M.E. Power, J. Berger, W.J. Bond, S.R. Carpenter, T.E. Essington, R.D. Holt, J.B.C. Jackson, R. J. Marquis, L. Oksanen, T. Oksanen, R.T. Paine, E.K. Pikitch, W.J. Ripple, S.A. Sandin, M. Scheffer, T.W. Schoener, J.B. Shurin, A.R.E. Sinclair, M.E. Soule, R. Virtanen, D.A. Wardle, "Trophic Downgrading of Planet Earth", *Science* 15 July 2011, Vol. 333 no. 6040 pp 301-306 (loss of apex predators has adverse effects on marine, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems, including disease, wildfire, carbon sequestration, and invasive species).
- Halofsky, J.S.(4), W.J. Ripple and R.L. Beschta, 2008, Recoupling fire and aspen recruitment after wolf reintroduction in Yellowstone National Park, USA. *Forest ecology and management* 256(5):1004-1008.
- Halofsky, J.S.(4), W.J. Ripple. "Linkages between wolf presence and aspen recruitment in the Galatin elk winter range of southwestern Montana, USA. *Forestry: An International Journal of Forest Research* 81(2), April, 2008: 195-207.
- Hudak, M. Commercial Livestock Production on Federal Public Lands: Environmental Destruction at Taxpayer Expense. June 29, 2000
- Jones, Alison, 2001. "Review and Analyses of Cattle Grazing Effects in the Arid West, with implications for BLM Grazing Management in Southern Utah." *Wild Utah Project*, Salt Lake City, Utah. <http://rangenet.org/directory/jonesa/litrev.html>.
- Mech L.D., D.W. Smith, K.M. Murphy and D.R. MacNulty. 2001. Winter severity and wolf predation on a formerly wolf-free elk herd. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 65:998-1003.
- Ripple, W. J. and Beschta, R.L. "Willow thickets protect young aspen from elk browsing after wolf reintroduction." *Western North American Naturalist* 65 (1), 2005: 118-122.
- Smith, R. 2005. "Impacts to Wildlife Resulting from Livestock Grazing at the US Sheep Experiment Station", *Forest Guardians*, Santa Fe, NM.

Stahler, D.R. B. Heinrich and D.W. Smith, 2002. Common ravens, *corvus corax*, preferentially associate with grey wolves, *Canis lupus*, as a foraging strategy in winter." *Animal Behaviour* 64(2): 283.

Wilmers, C.C. and W.M. Getz, 2005. "Gray wolves as climate change buffers in Yellowstone." *PLoS Biology* 3:571.

Wilmers, C.C., R.L. Crabtree, D.W. Smith, K.M. Murphy and W.M. Getz, 2003. "Trophic facilitation by introduced top predators: gray wolf subsidies to scavengers in Yellowstone National Park." *Journal of Animal Ecology* 72:909-916.

Ecological Dynamics on Yellowstone's Northern Range. The National Academy of Science, 2002.

"Study says that with more wolves and fewer elk, trees rebounding in portions of Yellowstone," *The Washington Post*, January 2, 2012.

"Decline in big predators wreaking havoc on ecosystems, OSU researchers say." *The Oregonian*, October 1, 2009.



Cattle Death Loss

ISSN:

Released May 12, 2011, by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), Agricultural Statistics Board, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

Cattle and Calf Death Losses

This report is released every five years as a cooperative effort between the National Agricultural Statistics Service and Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service – Wildlife Services and Veterinary Services. The information presented in this report is based on producer reports from the January 2011 Cattle survey and includes detailed percentage breakouts of cattle and calf losses by predators and non-predator causes as well as non-lethal control measures.

Cattle and calf losses from predators and non-predator causes in the United States totaled 3.99 million head (excluding Alaska) during 2010. This represents 4.3 percent of the 93.9 million cattle and calves in the United States at the beginning of 2010. Losses of cattle weighing more than 500 pounds totaled 1.73 million head or 43.4 percent of total losses. Calves weighing less than 500 pounds lost to all causes totaled 2.26 million head or 56.6 percent of total losses.

Cattle and calf losses from animal predators totaled nearly 220 thousand head during 2010. This represented 5.5 percent of the total deaths from all causes and resulted in a loss of \$98.5 million to farmers and ranchers. Coyotes and dogs caused the majority of cattle and calf predator losses accounting for 53.1 percent and 9.9 percent respectively.

Cattle and calf losses from non-predator causes totaled 3.77 million head or 94.5 percent of the total losses during 2010. Respiratory problems represented the leading cause of non-predator deaths, accounting for 28.0 percent, followed by digestive problems at 13.4 percent.

Non-lethal predator control measures cost farmers and ranchers throughout the United States \$188.5 million during 2010. Use of guard animals was the most common method at 36.9 percent. Exclusion fencing, frequent checking, and culling were the next most commonly used methods of preventing cattle and calf losses at 32.8 percent, 32.1 percent, and 28.9 percent respectively.

This page intentionally left blank.

Contents

Number of Head and Total Value of Cattle and Calf Death Loss by Cause – United States: 2010 5

Number of Head of Cattle and Calves Lost by Cause – States and United States: 2010..... 6

Total Value per Head and Total Value of Cattle and Calf Losses by Cause – States and United States: 2010..... 7

Percent of Total Cattle Predator Losses by Predator – States and United States: 2010..... 8

Percent of Total Calf Predator Losses by Predator – States and United States: 2010 9

Percent of Total Cattle Non-Predator Losses by Type – States and United States: 2010..... 10

Percent of Total Calf Non-Predator Losses by Type – States and United States: 2010 12

Percent of Operations using Non-Lethal Methods to Prevent Losses of Cattle and Calves to Predators by
Method– States and United States: 2010 14

Statistical Methodology 16

Terms and Definitions..... 16

Information Contacts 16

This page intentionally left blank.

Number of Head and Total Value of Cattle and Calf Death Loss by Cause – United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

Cause	Number of head (number)	Percent of total (percent)	Total value (1,000 dollars)
Predator			
Coyotes	116,700	53.1	48,185
Mountain lions and bobcats ¹	18,900	8.6	9,221
Dogs	21,800	9.9	10,067
Vultures	11,900	5.4	4,641
Wolves	8,100	3.7	3,646
Bears	2,800	1.3	1,415
Other predators	12,400	5.6	6,352
Unknown predators	27,300	12.4	14,948
Total predator	219,900	100.0	98,475
Non-predator			
Digestive problems	505,000	13.4	267,799
Respiratory problems	1,055,000	28.0	643,146
Metabolic problems	59,800	1.6	47,558
Mastitis	62,000	1.6	59,112
Lameness/injury	140,900	3.7	112,251
Other diseases	179,500	4.8	114,577
Weather related	489,000	13.0	274,092
Calving problems	494,000	13.1	274,670
Polsoning	36,100	0.9	26,817
Theft	15,100	0.4	9,309
Other non-predator	301,600	8.0	247,092
Unknown non-predator	435,000	11.5	276,476
Total non-predator	3,773,000	100.0	2,352,899
United States Total ²	3,992,900	100.0	2,451,374

¹ Includes cougars, pumas and lynx.
Excludes Alaska.

Number of Head of Cattle and Calves Lost by Cause – States and United States: 2010

State	All causes		Predators		Non-predators	
	Cattle	Calves	Cattle	Calves	Cattle	Calves
	(head)	(head)	(head)	(head)	(head)	(head)
Alabama	23,000	30,000	1,000	5,200	22,000	24,800
Arizona	20,000	18,000	2,200	2,100	17,800	15,900
Arkansas	35,000	40,000	1,900	4,800	33,100	35,200
California	100,000	135,000	1,400	8,200	98,600	126,800
Colorado	55,000	55,000	800	4,300	54,200	50,700
Connecticut	1,100	1,200	-	100	1,100	1,100
Delaware	400	500	-	-	400	500
Florida	23,000	31,000	900	5,400	22,100	25,600
Georgia	19,000	23,000	1,300	3,500	17,700	19,500
Hawaii	5,000	4,000	100	500	4,900	3,500
Idaho	42,000	51,000	1,900	4,200	40,100	46,800
Illinois	18,000	30,000	300	1,500	17,700	28,500
Indiana	13,000	22,000	100	800	12,900	21,200
Iowa	70,000	95,000	200	1,400	69,800	93,600
Kansas	125,000	80,000	800	3,900	124,200	76,100
Kentucky	44,000	68,000	1,200	9,500	42,800	58,500
Louisiana	18,000	19,000	1,800	4,600	16,200	14,400
Maine	1,900	2,700	-	300	1,900	2,400
Maryland	3,000	5,000	100	100	2,900	4,900
Massachusetts	1,000	1,000	-	-	1,000	1,000
Michigan	22,000	43,000	200	600	21,800	42,400
Minnesota	46,000	88,000	400	2,100	45,600	85,900
Mississippi	21,000	27,000	800	2,800	20,200	24,200
Missouri	65,000	125,000	700	6,500	64,300	118,500
Montana	23,000	57,000	1,000	4,200	22,000	52,800
Nebraska	110,000	85,000	200	2,200	109,800	82,800
Nevada	5,000	12,000	500	2,300	4,500	9,700
New Hampshire	800	800	-	-	800	800
New Jersey	500	700	-	100	500	600
New Mexico	22,000	35,000	3,300	6,600	18,700	28,400
New York	32,000	43,000	300	1,400	31,700	41,600
North Carolina	13,000	20,000	1,400	4,000	11,600	16,000
North Dakota	15,000	40,000	300	2,500	14,700	37,500
Ohio	21,000	29,000	500	2,300	20,500	26,700
Oklahoma	90,000	130,000	3,400	10,500	86,600	119,500
Oregon	20,000	35,000	600	3,200	19,400	31,800
Pennsylvania	35,000	43,000	100	600	34,900	42,400
Rhode Island	100	200	-	-	100	200
South Carolina	7,000	8,000	300	1,000	6,700	7,000
South Dakota	68,000	90,000	300	2,600	67,700	87,400
Tennessee	34,000	56,000	1,300	7,800	32,700	48,200
Texas	310,000	290,000	6,000	40,000	304,000	250,000
Utah	13,000	26,000	300	2,300	12,700	23,700
Vermont	6,000	8,000	100	200	5,900	7,800
Virginia	26,000	52,000	600	4,800	25,400	47,200
Washington	20,000	19,000	200	1,500	19,800	17,500
West Virginia	5,000	15,000	100	1,000	4,900	14,000
Wisconsin	75,000	140,000	500	3,100	74,500	136,900
Wyoming	11,000	30,000	400	3,500	10,600	26,500
United States ¹	1,733,800	2,259,100	39,800	180,100	1,694,000	2,079,000

- Represents zero.

¹ Excludes Alaska.

Total Value per Head and Total Value of Cattle and Calf Losses by Cause – States and United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Total value per head		Total value predator losses		Total value non-predator losses	
	Cattle ¹	Calves ²	Cattle	Calves	Cattle	Calves
	(dollars)	(dollars)	(1,000 dollars)	(1,000 dollars)	(1,000 dollars)	(1,000 dollars)
Alabama	852	324	852	1,685	18,744	8,035
Arizona	790	354	1,738	743	14,062	5,629
Arkansas	807	339	1,533	1,627	26,712	11,933
California	923	348	1,292	2,854	91,008	44,126
Colorado	1,037	372	830	1,600	56,205	18,860
Connecticut	1,095	300	-	30	1,205	330
Delaware	843	312	-	-	337	156
Florida	766	333	689	1,798	16,929	8,525
Georgia	793	330	1,031	1,155	14,036	6,435
Hawaii	520	273	52	137	2,548	956
Idaho	967	354	1,837	1,487	38,777	16,567
Illinois	1,001	336	300	504	17,718	9,576
Indiana	955	321	96	257	12,320	6,805
Iowa	1,097	360	219	504	76,571	33,696
Kansas	1,017	378	814	1,474	126,311	28,766
Kentucky	871	330	1,045	3,135	37,279	19,305
Louisiana	871	318	1,568	1,463	14,110	4,579
Maine	879	300	-	90	1,670	720
Maryland	911	312	91	31	2,642	1,529
Massachusetts	824	300	-	-	824	300
Michigan	942	278	188	167	20,536	11,787
Minnesota	987	375	395	788	45,007	32,213
Mississippi	821	315	657	882	16,584	7,623
Missouri	997	357	698	2,321	64,107	42,305
Montana	1,058	384	1,058	1,613	23,276	20,275
Nebraska	1,128	393	226	865	123,854	32,540
Nevada	969	369	485	849	4,361	3,579
New Hampshire	973	300	-	-	778	240
New Jersey	918	249	-	25	459	149
New Mexico	894	354	2,950	2,336	16,718	10,054
New York	911	276	273	386	28,879	11,482
North Carolina	838	315	1,173	1,260	9,721	5,040
North Dakota	1,135	366	341	915	16,685	13,725
Ohio	908	321	454	738	18,614	8,571
Oklahoma	914	360	3,108	3,780	79,152	43,020
Oregon	972	345	583	1,104	18,857	10,971
Pennsylvania	996	300	100	180	34,760	12,720
Rhode Island	951	300	-	-	95	60
South Carolina	843	315	253	315	5,648	2,205
South Dakota	1,133	381	340	991	76,704	33,299
Tennessee	820	324	1,066	2,527	26,814	15,617
Texas	889	354	5,334	14,160	270,256	88,500
Utah	984	360	295	828	12,497	8,532
Vermont	842	300	84	60	4,968	2,340
Virginia	801	330	481	1,584	20,345	15,576
Washington	949	342	190	513	18,790	5,985
West Virginia	884	297	88	297	4,332	4,158
Wisconsin	949	423	475	1,311	70,701	57,909
Wyoming	1,094	396	438	1,386	11,596	10,494
United States ³	952	354	35,720	62,755	1,615,102	737,797

- Represents zero.

¹ Cattle value per head is based on a two-year straight average of the value of beef cows reported in the January 1 Cattle survey from 2010 and 2011.

² Calf value per head is based on the market year average calf price. An average weight of 300 pounds was used in all States.

³ Excludes Alaska. United States value per head for cattle and calves derived.

Percent of Total Cattle Predator Losses by Predator – States and United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Coyotes	Mountain lions and bobcats ¹	Dogs	Vultures	Wolves	Bears	Other predators	Unknown predators
	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)
Alabama	38.3	-	49.9	3.4	-	-	-	8.4
Arizona	15.8	7.3	-	-	-	1.5	0.7	74.7
Arkansas	37.5	-	43.1	-	-	-	2.2	17.2
California	57.0	32.5	8.5	-	-	1.0	-	1.0
Colorado	17.7	4.0	0.8	-	-	21.4	47.6	8.5
Connecticut	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Delaware	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Florida	40.8	1.9	9.0	3.1	-	-	25.6	19.6
Georgia	7.0	-	14.1	0.1	-	-	71.5	7.3
Hawaii	-	-	67.2	-	-	-	14.8	18.0
Idaho	3.9	1.5	0.5	-	30.0	0.4	3.2	60.5
Illinois	66.5	17.4	-	-	-	-	16.1	-
Indiana	67.6	16.2	-	-	-	-	16.2	-
Iowa	38.0	7.1	26.1	-	-	-	-	28.8
Kansas	66.1	24.6	1.8	-	-	-	3.4	4.1
Kentucky	50.7	-	16.8	7.1	0.5	2.4	7.5	15.0
Louisiana	68.8	-	4.8	1.1	-	-	19.6	5.7
Maine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0
Massachusetts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michigan	59.5	-	25.0	-	-	-	15.5	-
Minnesota	52.1	5.4	7.0	-	16.8	-	-	18.7
Mississippi	79.3	-	17.2	-	-	-	3.5	-
Missouri	10.3	-	44.0	-	-	-	-	45.7
Montana	4.8	-	-	-	44.0	6.5	3.7	41.0
Nebraska	39.0	59.0	-	-	-	-	-	2.0
Nevada	4.7	17.3	-	-	-	-	-	78.0
New Hampshire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Jersey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Mexico	25.9	44.3	1.7	-	2.4	0.4	3.4	21.9
New York	7.3	-	5.9	-	-	-	-	86.8
North Carolina	26.1	-	23.1	-	-	6.8	-	44.0
North Dakota	85.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.2
Ohio	79.5	-	-	6.8	-	-	13.7	-
Oklahoma	35.7	6.8	19.5	7.8	-	-	13.6	16.6
Oregon	63.6	13.3	-	-	-	7.3	-	15.8
Pennsylvania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0
Rhode Island	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Carolina	65.8	-	6.3	-	-	-	25.5	2.4
South Dakota	72.0	24.0	-	4.0	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	62.1	-	26.4	-	-	-	-	11.5
Texas	22.2	27.7	6.5	6.0	-	0.1	11.3	26.2
Utah	44.0	1.9	-	-	-	42.8	0.4	10.9
Vermont	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	31.7	-	5.9	7.8	-	0.8	1.7	52.1
Washington	80.7	7.5	-	-	-	-	-	11.8
West Virginia	49.5	-	-	-	-	18.4	-	32.1
Wisconsin	31.5	-	-	-	58.0	10.5	-	-
Wyoming	19.8	11.9	1.0	-	18.6	15.7	-	33.0
United States ²	34.4	12.1	11.3	2.3	3.8	1.9	9.3	24.9

- Represents zero or less than 0.1 percent.

¹ Includes cougars, pumas, and lynx.

² Excludes Alaska.

Percent of Total Calf Predator Losses by Predator – States and United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Coyotes (percent)	Mountain lions and bobcats ¹ (percent)	Dogs (percent)	Vultures (percent)	Wolves (percent)	Bears (percent)	Other predators (percent)	Unknown predators (percent)
Alabama	48.4	1.5	26.0	9.9	-	-	6.7	7.5
Arizona	38.3	31.9	5.7	-	12.7	3.4	2.5	5.5
Arkansas	38.7	3.2	30.6	13.8	-	-	7.1	6.6
California	75.7	11.7	4.3	-	-	0.1	2.3	5.9
Colorado	82.2	6.3	1.0	-	-	7.8	0.3	2.4
Connecticut	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Delaware	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Florida	77.4	-	0.5	8.7	-	-	6.2	7.2
Georgia	53.7	-	15.8	12.5	-	-	13.3	4.7
Hawaii	-	-	89.9	-	-	-	7.5	2.6
Idaho	26.9	4.3	3.3	0.3	47.4	0.7	3.0	14.1
Illinois	87.9	7.1	1.0	0.3	-	-	1.6	2.1
Indiana	71.8	-	26.8	1.4	-	-	-	-
Iowa	66.9	1.0	13.9	-	-	-	8.4	9.8
Kansas	71.2	7.9	13.8	-	-	-	-	7.1
Kentucky	79.0	0.4	8.1	2.5	0.4	0.4	1.3	7.9
Louisiana	81.7	-	6.1	6.9	-	-	3.0	2.3
Maine	14.0	-	-	-	-	-	86.0	-
Maryland	56.6	-	6.6	-	-	-	-	36.8
Massachusetts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michigan	55.5	-	5.6	-	-	-	-	38.9
Minnesota	35.3	1.9	1.4	-	37.7	-	5.2	18.5
Mississippi	65.9	1.2	16.0	3.8	-	-	12.1	1.0
Missouri	29.5	14.4	33.2	3.8	-	2.2	1.5	15.4
Montana	46.9	5.2	-	-	20.3	2.3	1.6	23.7
Nebraska	59.4	37.5	-	-	-	-	-	3.1
Nevada	61.8	2.4	1.7	-	-	0.1	3.6	30.4
New Hampshire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Jersey	59.4	-	-	32.8	-	7.8	-	-
New Mexico	65.2	16.4	6.3	-	-	1.3	3.6	7.2
New York	88.5	1.8	3.6	-	-	-	-	6.1
North Carolina	63.7	-	12.1	10.4	-	-	1.8	12.0
North Dakota	86.2	3.7	1.7	-	0.7	-	2.4	5.3
Ohio	90.0	-	1.4	1.7	-	-	6.9	-
Oklahoma	52.6	7.1	13.8	4.4	1.5	1.5	9.3	9.8
Oregon	70.0	8.7	0.5	-	7.7	1.0	8.7	3.4
Pennsylvania	66.7	-	1.9	1.5	-	-	-	29.9
Rhode Island	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Carolina	80.2	0.5	5.0	7.0	-	-	3.8	3.5
South Dakota	95.5	3.5	-	-	-	-	1.0	-
Tennessee	62.5	0.3	16.0	8.8	-	-	0.9	11.5
Texas	40.1	15.4	9.3	14.0	0.4	-	7.9	12.9
Utah	58.8	6.2	4.8	-	1.8	15.4	9.8	3.2
Vermont	95.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.8
Virginia	65.0	-	7.5	12.9	-	5.4	0.8	8.4
Washington	77.3	3.4	-	-	2.4	3.3	-	13.6
West Virginia	80.9	-	-	-	-	8.8	-	10.3
Wisconsin	42.0	3.2	-	0.1	47.5	0.9	-	6.3
Wyoming	46.5	11.5	1.7	-	14.6	7.7	3.3	14.7
United States ²	57.2	7.8	9.6	6.1	3.7	1.1	4.8	9.7

- Represents zero or less than 0.1 percent..

¹ Includes cougars, pumas, and lynx.

² Excludes Alaska.

Percent of Total Cattle Non-Predator Losses by Type – States and United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Digestive problems (percent)	Respiratory problems (percent)	Metabolic problems (percent)	Mastitis (percent)	Lameness or injury (percent)	Other diseases (percent)
Alabama	4.9	5.3	2.6	0.7	3.9	5.9
Arizona	8.6	10.9	0.5	3.1	5.0	1.1
Arkansas	8.1	13.6	1.2	1.1	1.2	11.0
California	7.9	27.3	3.9	10.6	11.0	5.6
Colorado	18.2	39.7	1.6	2.0	5.3	7.1
Connecticut	13.9	11.1	8.5	23.0	13.2	5.5
Delaware	8.9	2.7	1.5	21.6	6.2	6.2
Florida	5.9	10.8	3.8	5.3	6.8	2.3
Georgia	4.6	12.5	3.1	2.5	4.6	7.0
Hawaii	1.0	0.6	0.3	-	0.6	2.2
Idaho	13.4	25.6	5.6	7.6	9.9	8.1
Illinois	14.0	25.6	4.5	3.2	10.5	3.9
Indiana	10.9	20.9	6.7	3.8	8.9	2.4
Iowa	10.0	45.5	1.5	2.3	6.8	3.8
Kansas	5.2	63.8	0.3	0.7	1.8	2.9
Kentucky	9.9	35.7	1.0	1.1	3.3	1.9
Louisiana	4.1	11.6	0.2	1.1	4.8	5.6
Maine	5.6	30.5	16.0	6.5	20.9	2.7
Maryland	9.7	6.5	6.4	7.5	9.1	5.3
Massachusetts	9.6	8.1	13.0	16.8	6.9	0.2
Michigan	11.4	27.1	7.6	9.2	9.1	6.0
Minnesota	13.2	24.2	5.1	6.8	8.4	4.6
Mississippi	5.1	14.3	1.7	0.7	3.9	3.3
Missouri	4.5	11.5	1.5	1.0	5.0	8.3
Montana	6.6	16.9	0.7	0.5	5.1	4.7
Nebraska	9.3	39.2	0.4	0.3	4.2	2.0
Nevada	8.0	11.0	4.3	3.7	8.1	6.0
New Hampshire	8.5	6.2	9.0	7.5	11.6	9.9
New Jersey	2.7	7.1	8.3	0.8	7.9	2.7
New Mexico	19.8	18.2	2.9	17.7	2.7	7.2
New York	11.3	11.5	8.4	13.3	17.7	4.5
North Carolina	4.6	11.3	5.6	3.0	6.1	4.3
North Dakota	9.7	24.7	0.7	0.2	3.0	4.2
Ohio	13.0	25.7	5.7	6.3	12.7	3.9
Oklahoma	4.7	28.3	0.6	0.5	3.9	6.8
Oregon	9.9	9.9	4.5	5.0	12.4	3.6
Pennsylvania	10.1	14.3	6.1	16.8	13.2	9.8
Rhode Island	36.6	-	3.6	3.6	13.4	5.3
South Carolina	19.8	6.5	1.7	4.2	3.2	4.0
South Dakota	12.6	31.1	2.7	1.9	5.4	5.2
Tennessee	5.1	11.6	1.6	1.3	5.1	5.2
Texas	7.3	22.1	1.2	1.2	2.8	4.8
Utah	12.6	19.3	5.9	3.8	6.5	2.8
Vermont	14.0	10.0	6.6	16.7	12.8	9.5
Virginia	4.3	12.4	2.5	2.8	7.8	6.3
Washington	10.7	25.5	3.9	8.1	8.6	6.7
West Virginia	7.3	9.2	2.1	1.3	4.6	5.6
Wisconsin	10.8	17.3	8.2	9.4	17.5	5.0
Wyoming	5.2	11.7	1.6	1.4	3.0	5.5
United States ¹	8.7	26.5	2.6	3.7	6.1	5.0

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Percent of Total Cattle Non-Predator Losses by Type – States and United States: 2010 (continued)

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Weather related (percent)	Calving problems (percent)	Poisoning (percent)	Theft (percent)	Other non-predator (percent)	Unknown non-predator (percent)
Alabama	16.4	16.8	3.1	1.3	25.1	14.0
Arizona	8.5	6.7	1.9	0.1	6.1	47.5
Arkansas	16.3	12.1	6.3	0.1	19.3	9.7
California	1.5	10.2	-	0.2	12.9	8.9
Colorado	5.2	3.3	2.3	0.1	5.7	9.5
Connecticut	0.7	9.7	4.3	0.6	4.9	4.6
Delaware	-	20.1	-	-	10.8	22.0
Florida	18.5	17.6	1.5	0.1	20.7	6.7
Georgia	3.4	21.8	0.3	-	26.4	13.8
Hawaii	74.4	6.5	0.1	2.5	9.8	2.0
Idaho	3.1	9.0	2.6	0.1	9.7	5.3
Illinois	11.4	9.4	0.9	-	12.5	4.1
Indiana	1.8	15.1	0.5	0.9	13.5	14.6
Iowa	8.5	7.1	0.6	-	7.2	6.7
Kansas	13.0	3.2	0.3	0.3	4.3	4.2
Kentucky	6.5	8.8	1.7	-	14.5	15.6
Louisiana	17.1	15.7	4.2	-	19.9	15.7
Maine	-	6.7	-	-	5.1	6.0
Maryland	1.6	12.8	0.3	-	22.0	18.8
Massachusetts	1.4	16.6	4.7	2.4	10.7	9.6
Michigan	1.5	8.6	-	-	7.7	11.8
Minnesota	5.3	7.7	1.2	-	14.3	9.2
Mississippi	17.1	17.4	0.7	0.6	21.6	13.6
Missouri	20.7	14.9	1.0	1.2	20.0	10.4
Montana	9.7	7.1	3.6	1.1	19.7	24.3
Nebraska	17.9	4.8	0.4	0.2	7.2	14.1
Nevada	1.5	4.2	6.8	9.4	9.5	27.5
New Hampshire	-	18.5	-	-	16.0	12.8
New Jersey	21.3	9.4	-	-	39.2	0.6
New Mexico	3.2	7.2	1.8	1.1	5.3	12.9
New York	1.6	11.0	2.3	0.2	10.5	7.7
North Carolina	10.9	21.3	0.5	1.0	21.0	10.4
North Dakota	16.0	2.4	0.4	0.4	22.4	15.9
Ohio	2.4	14.7	0.2	0.1	10.8	4.5
Oklahoma	11.1	10.4	0.4	1.8	18.6	12.9
Oregon	3.3	8.4	1.7	0.1	29.7	11.5
Pennsylvania	1.3	10.1	0.3	-	9.7	8.3
Rhode Island	-	6.3	-	-	31.2	-
South Carolina	10.4	18.4	1.4	0.2	20.0	10.2
South Dakota	13.1	5.9	3.1	0.1	13.3	5.6
Tennessee	7.9	16.8	1.9	0.7	28.1	14.7
Texas	10.8	12.2	1.4	0.2	17.4	18.6
Utah	6.2	4.8	3.7	1.4	13.6	19.4
Vermont	0.5	10.8	0.9	-	7.2	11.0
Virginia	19.4	14.3	2.5	-	17.3	10.4
Washington	3.0	6.8	-	0.1	13.8	12.8
West Virginia	28.2	18.4	2.7	2.1	9.6	8.9
Wisconsin	3.1	10.9	1.3	-	8.8	7.7
Wyoming	15.2	6.6	7.5	1.3	17.0	24.0
United States ¹	9.9	9.8	1.4	0.4	13.8	12.1

- Represents zero or less than 0.1 percent..

¹ Excludes Alaska.

Percent of Total Calf Non-Predator Losses by Type – States and United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Digestive problems (percent)	Respiratory problems (percent)	Metabolic problems (percent)	Lameness or injury (percent)	Other diseases (percent)
Alabama	5.0	12.7	2.5	2.8	4.7
Arizona	15.0	25.2	-	1.1	6.2
Arkansas	4.3	24.7	0.1	1.3	4.9
California	24.1	46.6	2.1	1.6	5.8
Colorado	18.4	30.8	0.2	1.2	2.6
Connecticut	38.8	20.5	0.4	1.1	6.0
Delaware	21.4	18.9	2.4	-	16.0
Florida	12.4	14.1	2.0	2.7	14.4
Georgia	8.1	16.4	0.5	1.0	2.6
Hawaii	5.6	4.7	-	2.6	4.3
Idaho	24.9	33.9	1.8	3.0	5.5
Illinois	18.1	25.8	0.3	2.8	5.2
Indiana	25.6	29.5	0.7	0.5	1.5
Iowa	21.0	30.7	0.5	1.3	1.7
Kansas	8.3	35.4	0.3	1.5	2.2
Kentucky	14.8	21.0	0.1	2.1	5.9
Louisiana	4.9	22.5	0.1	0.4	3.7
Maine	24.8	30.5	4.4	6.5	2.0
Maryland	14.6	13.4	0.6	3.8	6.9
Massachusetts	21.8	15.0	-	10.0	7.1
Michigan	30.1	41.7	0.1	1.4	2.9
Minnesota	27.7	31.6	1.3	2.6	2.8
Mississippi	5.7	24.7	0.5	2.8	1.5
Missouri	10.1	24.8	0.2	1.4	2.1
Montana	14.3	13.6	0.1	0.7	1.2
Nebraska	15.9	22.6	0.5	0.9	2.2
Nevada	12.1	21.6	-	0.7	0.9
New Hampshire	35.9	34.6	3.8	0.7	0.4
New Jersey	6.0	10.2	-	-	5.1
New Mexico	15.1	33.1	1.3	2.9	3.8
New York	32.9	31.8	2.4	3.2	7.6
North Carolina	9.4	18.7	2.6	2.8	6.7
North Dakota	14.5	28.6	0.4	0.8	3.0
Ohio	27.2	28.5	0.5	3.0	4.6
Oklahoma	4.3	35.1	0.8	2.0	6.4
Oregon	18.4	31.2	1.1	1.6	3.8
Pennsylvania	25.3	39.0	0.4	1.3	4.3
Rhode Island	39.0	22.0	-	-	-
South Carolina	24.4	10.7	1.5	0.5	2.8
South Dakota	12.8	29.2	0.3	0.4	0.9
Tennessee	14.4	21.0	0.6	2.6	6.6
Texas	11.8	28.2	0.5	2.2	9.2
Utah	23.4	25.7	0.5	0.9	2.1
Vermont	38.6	28.4	1.6	1.9	2.3
Virginia	9.9	12.7	0.2	1.8	3.8
Washington	19.4	31.8	0.8	2.8	4.9
West Virginia	8.0	12.7	-	2.6	4.2
Wisconsin	38.1	37.5	1.3	2.0	4.3
Wyoming	9.3	18.3	0.1	0.4	3.9
United States ¹	17.2	29.1	0.8	1.8	4.5

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Percent of Total Calf Non-Predator Losses by Type – States and United States: 2010 (continued)

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Weather related (percent)	Calving problems (percent)	Poisoning (percent)	Theft (percent)	Other non-predator (percent)	Unknown non-predator (percent)
Alabama	20.5	22.0	0.2	0.7	7.1	21.8
Arizona	9.3	12.1	0.2	3.1	3.6	24.2
Arkansas	16.6	20.1	8.5	-	5.9	13.6
California	3.6	7.0	0.1	0.1	1.9	7.1
Colorado	15.8	17.1	2.4	0.2	4.1	7.2
Connecticut	1.6	7.3	-	-	4.2	20.1
Delaware	-	35.4	-	-	-	5.9
Florida	11.0	29.2	0.4	0.1	0.3	13.4
Georgia	7.0	35.6	2.6	-	3.7	22.5
Hawaii	66.5	5.9	-	1.2	4.3	4.9
Idaho	5.4	20.5	0.1	0.2	1.0	3.7
Illinois	13.7	20.5	-	-	8.6	5.0
Indiana	7.3	13.4	0.1	-	6.1	15.3
Iowa	12.5	19.2	0.6	-	4.1	8.4
Kansas	24.6	15.3	0.1	0.5	2.4	9.4
Kentucky	19.4	13.5	0.7	0.6	3.5	18.4
Louisiana	23.4	22.8	3.1	2.0	5.4	11.7
Maine	11.4	10.9	-	-	1.3	8.2
Maryland	32.8	9.4	-	-	5.9	12.6
Massachusetts	10.3	12.5	-	-	14.7	8.6
Michigan	5.0	5.6	-	0.2	4.3	8.7
Minnesota	7.6	16.4	0.9	-	1.9	7.2
Mississippi	12.7	31.1	0.4	0.6	2.1	17.9
Missouri	28.8	20.7	0.1	-	2.2	9.6
Montana	27.1	22.4	1.3	2.3	1.6	15.4
Nebraska	28.0	23.2	0.3	-	1.3	5.1
Nevada	9.2	7.5	0.7	-	-	47.3
New Hampshire	-	19.0	1.1	-	0.5	4.0
New Jersey	21.6	27.2	-	-	12.5	17.4
New Mexico	15.1	6.0	1.1	3.2	4.5	13.9
New York	1.7	10.9	0.2	0.3	4.1	4.9
North Carolina	17.7	16.8	0.3	0.4	3.6	21.0
North Dakota	26.3	17.7	0.2	0.1	2.8	5.6
Ohio	8.3	24.7	-	-	0.6	2.6
Oklahoma	15.0	17.8	0.7	1.5	4.6	11.8
Oregon	10.5	19.2	0.2	-	2.8	11.2
Pennsylvania	2.5	12.9	0.6	-	3.6	10.1
Rhode Island	4.9	29.2	-	-	4.9	-
South Carolina	3.8	23.9	0.3	-	1.2	30.9
South Dakota	36.8	15.6	0.1	0.1	0.6	3.2
Tennessee	11.0	26.8	0.6	0.5	6.0	9.9
Texas	10.9	11.5	0.5	0.4	3.8	21.0
Utah	21.3	7.7	0.2	2.2	2.1	13.9
Vermont	1.6	9.5	-	-	2.2	13.9
Virginia	30.0	15.5	0.3	-	12.1	13.7
Washington	3.7	17.1	0.1	-	3.2	16.2
West Virginia	52.6	12.4	-	0.6	2.2	4.7
Wisconsin	5.5	5.7	0.3	-	1.6	3.7
Wyoming	29.0	25.0	0.5	0.4	2.6	10.5
United States ¹	15.4	15.8	0.6	0.4	3.3	11.1

- Represents zero or less than 0.1 percent.

¹ Excludes Alaska.

Percent of Operations using Non-Lethal Methods to Prevent Losses of Cattle and Calves to Predators by Method— States and United States: 2010

[Use of multiple non-lethal methods will result in percentages summing to greater than 100]

State	Guard animals (percent)	Exclusion fencing (percent)	Herding (percent)	Night penning (percent)	Fright tactics (percent)
Alabama	53.0	32.1	1.2	1.5	1.4
Arizona	26.8	8.5	81.8	53.4	0.1
Arkansas	51.7	15.0	0.3	11.1	3.2
California	29.8	74.6	1.6	0.5	1.4
Colorado	27.5	22.6	1.7	28.5	2.7
Connecticut	59.0	35.2	1.2	1.2	-
Delaware	-	-	-	-	-
Florida	37.4	14.1	2.8	2.3	0.5
Georgia	49.2	31.9	1.9	0.6	-
Hawaii	0.8	80.6	0.4	-	2.1
Idaho	21.8	19.6	10.9	12.7	12.8
Illinois	39.9	42.5	2.9	20.6	2.7
Indiana	16.4	36.8	2.3	18.0	4.8
Iowa	46.5	22.3	-	6.6	-
Kansas	19.1	10.3	7.1	-	8.3
Kentucky	36.9	52.2	2.2	1.7	0.2
Louisiana	31.0	38.5	7.9	-	2.0
Maine	46.5	85.7	-	7.6	-
Maryland	-	80.5	-	-	-
Massachusetts	26.7	93.1	1.2	22.7	0.5
Michigan	38.6	23.3	-	2.8	0.8
Minnesota	59.0	24.9	5.2	12.8	6.7
Mississippi	72.4	17.2	-	-	-
Missouri	35.9	31.2	6.0	4.8	-
Montana	34.6	3.1	12.7	19.8	4.4
Nebraska	24.5	48.1	1.7	5.1	2.7
Nevada	58.1	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire	4.0	59.6	5.2	13.2	-
New Jersey	0.8	94.1	-	17.8	19.3
New Mexico	38.0	25.3	5.7	11.5	0.1
New York	23.8	51.0	9.3	4.9	2.0
North Carolina	64.0	36.2	0.7	0.5	0.4
North Dakota	38.6	19.2	1.5	1.0	16.4
Ohio	30.1	59.0	2.0	22.7	0.7
Oklahoma	41.8	24.7	8.9	3.6	3.2
Oregon	27.3	24.4	1.7	7.2	1.9
Pennsylvania	6.3	78.4	5.6	5.7	2.0
Rhode Island	10.9	94.5	5.5	13.1	-
South Carolina	16.5	65.7	7.3	-	0.5
South Dakota	39.9	16.9	0.6	14.6	4.5
Tennessee	33.9	33.9	4.6	4.2	0.5
Texas	50.2	24.1	4.7	1.2	1.3
Utah	17.9	79.2	6.9	0.5	0.4
Vermont	37.3	82.7	4.5	4.5	-
Virginia	36.8	17.8	10.1	6.0	5.1
Washington	45.7	32.2	1.6	0.4	10.7
West Virginia	47.0	47.3	15.3	9.9	0.1
Wisconsin	27.0	41.3	5.4	22.1	5.0
Wyoming	19.8	23.5	22.7	19.4	3.5
United States ¹	36.9	32.8	5.3	6.6	2.5

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Percent of Operations using Non-Lethal Methods to Prevent Losses of Cattle and Calves to Predators by Method— States and United States: 2010 (continued)

[Use of multiple non-lethal methods will result in percentages summing to greater than 100]

State	Livestock carcass removal (percent)	Culling (percent)	Frequent checks (percent)	Other non-lethal (percent)
Alabama	17.2	20.4	14.2	2.4
Arizona	0.7	5.4	46.8	0.6
Arkansas	7.8	46.6	22.5	-
California	26.6	5.2	20.3	7.3
Colorado	21.1	18.6	36.8	17.6
Connecticut	1.2	-	-	5.9
Delaware	-	-	-	100.0
Florida	74.2	68.5	80.6	0.4
Georgia	25.1	34.9	21.0	9.2
Hawaii	2.1	12.8	9.9	4.5
Idaho	28.8	36.3	66.4	13.4
Illinois	38.5	28.1	13.7	4.2
Indiana	40.1	31.3	35.3	4.3
Iowa	22.8	30.7	32.3	23.9
Kansas	45.4	40.6	41.4	1.4
Kentucky	14.2	14.2	18.1	4.8
Louisiana	17.9	19.7	24.5	18.9
Maine	-	-	-	-
Maryland	14.0	32.4	29.3	1.3
Massachusetts	-	-	-	-
Michigan	15.4	24.7	14.5	11.2
Minnesota	17.7	14.7	23.1	3.7
Mississippi	0.7	0.7	4.1	14.0
Missouri	18.8	44.4	15.3	0.1
Montana	36.9	30.1	26.6	17.1
Nebraska	63.7	72.7	64.9	11.6
Nevada	17.1	23.3	36.2	-
New Hampshire	4.0	3.8	28.5	1.1
New Jersey	2.9	8.3	20.7	0.8
New Mexico	13.5	9.2	37.6	0.9
New York	11.5	26.5	19.3	2.0
North Carolina	10.7	2.6	9.3	-
North Dakota	20.8	30.8	26.6	11.5
Ohio	22.6	19.8	44.4	4.4
Oklahoma	18.2	24.7	16.7	14.3
Oregon	12.9	12.6	60.9	5.9
Pennsylvania	17.5	21.2	15.2	7.4
Rhode Island	18.5	13.1	18.5	-
South Carolina	28.3	26.6	39.0	1.0
South Dakota	12.1	18.8	37.7	15.3
Tennessee	25.3	22.0	45.0	7.6
Texas	8.1	31.4	29.6	7.2
Utah	12.6	21.9	17.6	50.8
Vermont	4.5	12.7	4.5	-
Virginia	34.3	47.9	37.7	14.8
Washington	1.3	2.6	2.2	11.4
West Virginia	10.2	33.8	15.2	13.9
Wisconsin	19.0	22.4	31.4	6.6
Wyoming	42.9	28.3	47.0	8.3
United States ¹	23.9	28.9	32.1	7.0

- Represents zero or less than 0.1 percent.

¹ Excludes Alaska.

Statistical Methodology

Survey Procedures: A random sample of United States producers were contacted during the January Cattle Inventory survey to provide data for these estimates. Survey procedures ensured that all cattle producers, regardless of size, had a chance to be included in the survey. Large producers were sampled more heavily than small operations. Data were collected from about 40,000 operators during the first half of January by mail, telephone, and face-to-face personal interviews and 78 percent of the reports were usable.

Estimating Procedures: These estimates of death loss were prepared by the Livestock Branch of the National Agricultural Statistics Service using producer data from the January 2011 Cattle survey. Cattle and calf inventory estimates were published in the *Cattle* report released on January 28, 2011 while total cattle and calf death losses from all causes were published in the *Meat Animals Production, Disposition and Income* report released on April 28, 2011. In setting the predator and non-predator loss estimates, first total predator and non-predator losses were estimated first as a percent of total losses, then specific predator and non-predator losses were estimated as a percent of total predator and non-predator losses. Value estimates were rounded to the nearest \$1,000.

Revision Policy: Revisions to previous estimates are made to improve current estimates. Previous year estimates are subject to revision when current estimates are made. Estimates of losses from all causes are subject to revision in next year's *Meat Animals Production, Disposition and Income* report. No revisions to predator and non-predator loss estimates are planned.

Reliability: Since all cattle operators are not included in the sample, survey estimates are subject to sampling variability. Survey results are also subject to non-sampling errors such as omissions, duplications, and mistakes in reporting, recording, and processing the data. The effects of these errors cannot be measured directly. They are minimized through rigid quality controls in the data collection process and through a careful review of all reported data for consistency and reasonableness.

Terms and Definitions

Cattle includes all cows, bulls, steers, and heifers weighing over 500 pounds. This includes beef and milk breeds as well as cattle on feed.

Calves include beef and milk breed steers, heifers, and bulls weighing less than 500 pounds.

Information Contacts

Listed below are the commodity specialists in the Livestock Branch of the National Agricultural Statistics Service to contact for additional information. E-mail inquiries may be sent to nass@nass.usda.gov

Dan Kerestes, Chief, Livestock Branch	(202) 720-3570
Scott Hollis, Head, Livestock Section	(202) 690-2424
Travis Averill – Dairy Products Prices	(202) 690-2168
Sherry Bertramsen – Livestock Slaughter	(515) 284-4340
Doug Bounds – Hogs and Pigs	(202) 720-3106
Jason Hardegree – Cattle, Cattle on Feed	(202) 720-3040
Mike Miller – Milk Production and Milk Cows	(202) 720-3278
Everett Olbert – Sheep and Goats	(202) 720-4751
Lorie Warren – Dairy Products	(202) 690-3236

Access to NASS Reports

For your convenience, you may access NASS reports and products the following ways:

- All reports are available electronically, at no cost, on the NASS web site: <http://www.nass.usda.gov>
- Both national and state specific reports are available via a free e-mail subscription. To set-up this free subscription, visit <http://www.nass.usda.gov> and in the "Receive NASS Updates" box under "Receive reports by Email," click on "National" or "State" to select the reports you would like to receive.
- Printed reports may be purchased from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) by calling toll-free (800) 999-6779, or (703) 605-6220 if calling from outside the United States or Canada. Accepted methods of payment are Visa, MasterCard, check, or money order.

For more information on NASS surveys and reports, call the NASS Agricultural Statistics Hotline at (800) 727-9540, 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. ET, or e-mail: nass@nass.usda.gov.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, political beliefs, genetic information, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Stop 9410, Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call toll-free at (866) 632-9992 (English) or (800) 877-8339 (TDD) or (866) 377-8642 (English Federal-relay) or (800) 845-6136 (Spanish Federal-relay). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.