The Cost and Market Impacts of Slow Growth Broilers

Jayson L. Lusk, Nathanael M. Thompson, and Shawna L. Weimer*

October 31, 2018

Abstract: There has been substantial productivity growth in the broiler industry over the past half-century, much of it resulting from selective breeding and genetic improvements. However, there are concerns that high growth rates adversely affect animal welfare, resulting in increasing demand for products from slow growth breeds perceived as having improved welfare. Using productivity data on two slower growing breeds (Ranger Classic and Ranger Gold) and two modern fast growing breeds (Ross 208 and Cobb 500), and almost 18 years of monthly price data, partial net returns are calculated. If the goal is to feed broilers to a constant end point, this research shows that production costs are about 25% per pound higher for slower growing breeds than modern breeds if all are fed for a constant number of days on feed and 11% higher if fed to a constant weight. If feeding times and weights are chosen to optimize net returns for each breed, costs average about 14% per pound higher for the slower-growing breeds. The breakeven wholesale price premiums needed equate the partial net returns of slow to fast growth broilers ranges from an average of $0.10/lb to $0.36/lb depending on the breed and the target end-point. If the entire U.S. broiler industry converted to slow growth breeds either through retailer pledges or regulation, annual costs to consumers are $630 million and annual costs to producers are $3.5 billion, under the assumption that producers optimize net returns. Increases in consumer willingness-to-pay of 8.5% would be needed to offset these producer surplus losses.

Keywords: broiler, production cost, slow growth

JEL Codes: Q11, Q12, D24

Contact: Jayson Lusk, 403 W. State Street, W. Lafayette, IN 47097; (765)494-1903; jlusk@purdue.edu

*Authors are Distinguished Professor and Head in the Department of Agricultural Economics at Purdue University, Assistant Professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics at Purdue University, and Assistant Professor in the Department of Animal and Avian Sciences at the University of Maryland

Introduction

The broiler industry experienced rapid productivity growth during the latter half of the 20th century. Since the 1950s, broiler body weight at six weeks of age has increased more than 3.3% per year, and the amount of feed needed to reach a target weight has halved (Zuidhof et al., 2014). The aggregate impacts have been substantial. Total poultry and egg output in the U.S. increased more than 650% from 1948 to 2015 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. 2018a), and the value of the partial productivity gains for the broiler industry from 1980 to 2012 have been estimated at $12.8 billion/year (Lusk, 2013). The gains in productivity, among other factors, led to a 60% reduction in the real price of chicken from 1960 to 2010, and chicken is now the most consumed animal protein in the United States (USDA-Economic Research Service, 2018b,c). Despite the consumer benefits that have accrued from lower chicken prices, and the resource savings from increased feed efficiency and growth, there are concerns that animal welfare has deteriorated.

While modern broilers only live about six weeks, there are concerns that the bird's legs are unable to adequately support the larger bodyweights, leading to pain and an inability to exhibit natural behaviors (e.g., de Jong et al., 2012; Sanotra, 2001; SCHAW, 2000). As a result of such findings, animal advocacy organizations have begun to pressure food retailers to use slower growing breeds (e.g., Trotter, 2018), European regulators have encouraged slow growth broilers (European Council, 2007), national media attention has begun to focus on the issue in (Charles, 2016; Strom, 2017), and some animal welfare standards and labels have begun to require slower growing broiler breeds (Global Animal Partnership, 2018). There has been some consumer research on demand for this attribute (e.g., Carlsson, Frykblom, and Lagerkvist, 2007; Lusk, 2018; Napolitano et al., 2013), but little is known about the added production costs associated with slow growth chickens. What little information exists comes from an industry report (Elanco Animal Health, 2016), which formed the basis of an info-graphic by the National Chicken Council (2017), which was critical of slow growth broilers.

The primary objective of this research is to determine the production costs and break-even price premiums for slow-growth chicken breeds relative to modern fast growth breeds. Once these outcomes are determined, this research uses an equilibrium displacement model to determine the market impacts of an industry-wide shift away from modern breeds toward slow growth breeds. Cost and market outcomes are calculated for three different scenarios that involve different behavioral assumptions on the part of broiler producers: i) feeding broiler flocks for a fixed number of days (either six or seven weeks), ii) feeding broiler flocks until they reach a target weight (six pounds), or iii) feeding flocks until net partial returns are maximized. Results are also analyzed using different assumptions about stocking densities given that adoption of slow growth breeds is often accompanied by reductions in stocking density motivated by animal welfare concerns. The next section provides details on the methods used to determine relative costs of production and to simulate market outcomes. The third section presents the results and the last section concludes.

Methods

A few studies have created budgets for broiler producers (e.g., Goodwin et al. 2005; Rhodes et al., 2011), but these costs of production are constructed from the perspective of a contractor who is provided feed, chicks, and other inputs from an integrator. Given the importance of feed costs, and the fact that slower and faster growing breeds have different feed efficiencies, a broader perspective is required. As a result, this analysis takes a holistic approach to determining costs associated with the broiler growth phase of the production process, including the opportunity costs of the birds, the barn, and the feed. No attempt is made to segregate or allocate the costs or returns to the integrator vs. the contractor.

One of the drivers of relative profitability in slow- and fast-growing broiler breeds is barn utilization. If faster growing breeds allow more broilers to be fed during the course of a year than slow growing breeds, then a greater amount of output can be produced in a barn with faster than slower growing breeds. Rather than specifying a particular barn size, and calculating outputs per barn, focus is on impacts on a square footage basis, which permits greater generalizations. Let τ be the number of flocks, i.e., the number of times a batch of broilers is brought into a barn (or a given square foot) per year. There are

(1) $$\tau = 365/(d + down)$$

flocks per year, where *d* is the number of days each flock is fed before harvest and *down* is the number of days of downtime required to transition the barn (or square foot) from one flock to another.

Now consider total meat production:

(2) $$q_d = wt_d \cdot yield_d \cdot sden_d \cdot \tau,$$

where q_d (lbs/ft^2/year) is total output of a flock fed for *d* days, wt_d (lbs/broiler) is a broiler's live body weight on day *d*, $yield_d$ is the dressing percentage expressed as the ratio of a broiler's dressed weight to live weight on day *d*, and $sden_d$ (broilers/ft^2) is the maximum allowable stocking density defined by animal welfare guidelines and determined by live weight at the final day on feed (as discussed momentarily, stocking density is often defined in the industry on a weight per square foot basis, which is subsequently converted to broilers per square foot for these calculations).

Once total production is known, then revenue, R_{td} (\$/ft^2/year), at time *t* for flocks fed *d* days can be calculated as:

(3) $$R_{td} = p_t \cdot q_d,$$

where p_t is the output price (\$/lb) of wholesale processed broilers, and q_d is defined by equation (2). The time subscript *t* is added to allow for the fact that prices change throughout time; this is distinct from *d* which is the total number of days a flock is on feed.

Cumulative variable costs, C_{td} (\$/ft^2/year), at time *t* for flocks fed *d* days are:

(4) $$C_{td} = \tau \cdot [\beta + sden_d \cdot (w_t \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{d} x_i + \alpha \cdot d + chick)],$$

where τ is the number of flocks per year defined in equation (1), β (\$/ft^2) is the cost of transitioning from one flock to another (e.g., clean-up and preparation costs), $sden_d$ (broilers/ft^2) is the stocking density, w_t (\$/lb) is the price of feed, x_i (lbs/broiler) is a broiler's feed intake on day *i*, making $\sum_{i=0}^{d} x_i$ a broiler's cumulative feed intake (\$/broiler) through *d* days, α is an additional daily cost (\$/broiler/day) that arises from electricity, labor, interest on the barn, etc., and *chick* is the price or opportunity cost (\$/chick) of new replacement broilers.

Taking the ratio of equation (4) to equation (3) provides the estimated cost per pound of production, Clb_{td} (\$/lb), at time *t* for broilers fed *d* days:

(5) $$Clb_{td} = C_{td}/q_d.$$

Finally, subtracting (4) from (3) provides estimated net partial returns, π_{td} (\$/ft^2/year):

(6) $$\pi_{td} = R_{td} - C_{td}.$$

These are only partial returns because they do not include fixed costs or other time-invariant costs that are the same regardless of which broiler breed is used for production.

A final metric of interest is the break-even output price premium, $\tilde{p}$. This is the difference in output prices (\$/lb) that equates the partial return of higher- and lower-performing broiler breeds. Let b1 and b2 indicate two different broiler breeds, where b2 has a higher return than b1. The task is to find the price difference, such that $\pi_{td}^{b1} = \pi_{td}^{b2}$, where the superscripts denote the breeds. Solving this equation yields the breakeven output price premium:

(7) $$\tilde{p}_{td} = \frac{\pi_{td}^{b2} - C_{td}^{b1}}{q_d^{b1}} - p_t^{b1}.$$

In the analysis that follows, we compare outcomes under different scenarios according to different behavioral assumptions about broiler producer behavior. First, the above equations are calculated assuming producers feed broilers for a targeted or fixed number of days on feed. In particular, we assumed *d* = 42 (six weeks) and *d* = 49 (seven weeks). These two values are chosen because seven weeks is the average time for a flock to be fed (MacDonald 2014), even though six weeks is a common industry stopping point. Of course, slower growing broilers will weigh less at a fixed number of days than faster growing birds. As a result, a second behavioral rule for producers is considered consistent with the idea that packers (and consumers) prefer to utilize carcasses of homogeneous size to minimize production and processing costs. In particular, outcomes are evaluated on the day *d* when live weight, wt_d, is at 6lbs, which is about the industry average for the past several years (National Chicken Council, 2018). Third, we compare outcomes across different broiler breeds when *d* is chosen to maximize net partial returns defined by equation (6).

The first three scenarios assume a fixed stocking density for each breed so that *ceteris paribus* comparison can be made and differences in costs and returns are driven only by performance. However, it is important to realize that adoption of slow growth is typically accompanied with other animal welfare criteria, where stocking density is restricted. As such, the final scenario repeats the exercise of choosing optimal net returns, except, consistent with industry standards, different stocking densities are used for slow and fast growth breeds. Each of these four scenarios is compared at different input and output prices at different points in time, *t*.

Data

At present, there is no uniform definition for slow growth broilers, but more than 25 organizations have joined onto a letter referred to as the European Chicken Commitment (2018) or the "European Broiler Ask", which references seven specific breeds, and two of these (Ranger Classic and Ranger Gold) are used to represent slow growth broiler performance in this study. Performance data for these two slow-breed broilers (Ranger Classic and Ranger Gold) and for two widely-used modern fast-growing broiler breeds (Ross 308 and Cobb 500) were obtained from the respective companies (Aviagen 2014, 2018a,b; Cobb-Vantress, 2015). These data consist of a broilers body weight, wt_d, by day on feed for broilers "as hatched" (i.e., mix of male and female broilers). Figure 1 shows the growth curves relating wt_d to *d* for each of the four broiler breeds studied in this paper. As advertised, the slower growing Ranger Gold and Ranger Classic broilers have lower body weights than the faster growing breeds, Ross 308 and Cobb 500. The slower-growing breeds take 54 and 59 days, respectively to reach 6 lbs, whereas the faster growing breeds both hit this target weight in about 41 days.

Performance data from commercial breeders also provides information on daily feed intake, x_d, and $yield_d$. The data on yield from the breeders is only provided in categories for different body weights, and by gender, so regressions are used to provide a yield estimate at each body weight (estimated as a quadratic equation), which is a function of *d*, and then the prediction was averaged for males and females. Performance data for the two slow growing breeds and for Ross 308 are available for days 0 to 70, but for Cobb 500, data is only reported up to 63 days on feed. For uniform comparisons, cubic trend regressions were used to project performance out to 70 days for Cobb 500.

Monthly data on output prices for broilers, p_t, were obtained from January 2000 to September 2018 (N=225). Georgia dock wholesale prices for whole broilers are used up until April, 2012, after which the USDA National Composite Weighted Average wholesale broiler price was used. Prior to April 2012, the USDA did not report a wholesale broiler price, and the Georgia dock price ceased being reported in at the end of 2016. Over the time period in question, the wholesale price of whole broilers averaged \$0.81/lb, with a low of \$0.56/lb and a high of \$1.19/lb.

To calculate a feed price, monthly average data were obtained from January 2000 to September 2018 on nearby futures prices for corn, soybean meal, and soybean oil, each of which was converted to a dollars-per-pound basis (it was assumed ground corn was used, such that 1 bushel = 48lbs of ground corn). A weighted average feed price was calculated assuming a feed ration of 55% ground corn, 35% soybean meal, 5% soybean oil, and 5% other ingredients and additives (the latter of which was assumed to be priced at a fixed \$0.02/lb). Over the 225 months in question, the calculated feed price averaged \$0.11/lb (equivalent to an average of \$221/ton) and varied from a low of \$0.05/lb to a high of \$0.21/lb (or \$112/ton to \$426/ton).

Data reported by Goodwin et al. (2005), MacDonald (2014), and Rhodes et al. (2011), were used to guide the choice of other values used in the model. In particular, we assumed a flock transition time of 14 days (*down* = 14), a flock transition cost of \$0.015 per square foot (β=0.015), an opportunity cost of placement chicks of \$0.90/broiler (*chick* = 0.9), and an additional daily cost of \$0.0025 per broiler per day (α = 0.0025). MacDonald (2014) reports an average industry turnaround of 16 days, with 25% of producers experiencing 14 days or less downtime between flocks; the smaller number is used here because it is presumably associated with more efficient operations.

For the first three scenarios, stocking densities were determined by the National Chicken Council (2017b) Animal Welfare Guidelines, which specifies a maximum stocking density of 8.5 lbs/ft^2 for conventional broilers raised to final weights between 5.6 and 7.5 lbs/broiler (these are measured at the final day on feed). Assuming producers will stock up to the weight limit implies that on final day *d*, the stocking density will be $sden_d = 8.5/wt_d$ broilers per square foot. Given that the industry defines stocking density limits on a weight basis suggests that there will be more slow growth broilers (which are lighter on a given day) per square foot than fast growth broilers. For the fourth scenario, we incorporate the observation that adoption of slow growth breeds is typically accompanied with additional standards for lower stocking densities. In particular, the Global Animal Partnership (2018) mandates a maximum stocking density of 6 lbs/ft^2. Assuming again that producers will stock up to this limit implies a stocking density of $sden_d = 6/\ wt_d$ broilers per square foot for slow growth breeds.

Market Impacts

To determine the market impacts of a complete industry shift from fast to slow growth broilers, caused either by retailer and food manufacturer demands, a partial equilibrium model of the broiler-chicken industry is constructed. In particular, an equilibrium displacement model, which expresses proportionate changes in market prices and quantities as a function of elasticities and exogenous supply/demand shifts is used following Wohlgenant (1993, 2011) and Lusk and Anderson (2004). Retail demand for chicken is given by:

(8) $\hat{Q} = \eta(\hat{P} - \delta)$,

where $\hat{Q}$ and $\hat{P}$ are the proportionate changes in the retail quantity and price of chicken (e.g., $\hat{Q} = \Delta Q/Q$), respectively, η is the own-price elasticity of demand for chicken, and δ is an exogenous demand shock representing a proportionate increase in consumer willingness-to-pay. The supply of chicken and the demand for broilers are given by:

(9) $\hat{P} = S\hat{w}$, and

(10) $\hat{x} = -(1-S)\sigma\hat{w} + \hat{Q}$,

where $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{w}$ are the proportionate changes in the quantity and price of broilers, S is the share of the total cost of producing chicken attributable to broilers, and σ is the elasticity of substitution between broilers and marketing inputs in producing chicken (see Wohlgenant 1993 for details). Finally, the supply of broilers is:

(11) $\hat{x}_k = \varepsilon(\hat{w} - k)$,

where ε is the own-price supply elasticity, and k is an exogenous supply shifter.

Equations (8)-(11) represent a system of four equations with four unknown endogenous variables, $\hat{Q}$, $\hat{P}$, $\hat{x}$, and $\hat{w}$, which can be solved algebraically. Exact solutions for the endogenous variables are given in Lusk and Anderson (2004), who also show how to solve for the demand shift δ that would be needed to offset the producer welfare losses resulting from an adverse inward supply shift, k. Once solutions to the endogenous variables are determined, changes in producer and consumer surplus are calculated as:

(12) $\Delta CS = -P^0Q^0(\hat{P} + \delta)(1 + 0.5\hat{Q})$, and

(13) $\Delta PS = w^0x^0(\hat{w} - k)(1 + 0.5\hat{x})$.

where P^0Q^0 is represents total consumer expenditures on chicken and $w^0x^0$is value of boiler production (see Wohlgenant 1993, 2011).

To implement the model, the size of the supply shock, k, needs to be specified. k indicates the proportionate increase in marginal cost caused by a switch from fast to slow-growth breeds; it is the vertical shift in the supply curve expressed relative to the initial equilibrium price. Again, interest is in calculating the impact to producers and consumers if the entire industry shifted from fast to slow growth broilers. The percent change in the calculated cost/lb when moving from the average of the two fast growth breeds to the average of the two slow growth breeds is used to infer the size of the supply shift.

To implement the model, values also need to be assigned for the other parameters of the model. The values are assigned as follows: $\eta = -0.78$, (Gallet, 2010), $\varepsilon = 0.085$ (Holt and McKenzie, 2003), $\sigma = 0.1$ (Wohlgenant, 1989), $P^0Q^0 = \$53.98$ billion/year (calculated by multiplying per-capita consumption, population, and retail prices as reported by the USDA-Economic Research Service (2018b,c), averaged for the years 2013-2017), $w^0x^0 = \$29.67$ billion/year (calculated as the average value of boiler production for the years 2013-2017 as reported by USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, 2018), and $S = \$29.67/\$53.98 = 0.55$.

Results

Table 1 shows economic performance outcomes under the assumption that each broiler breed is fed for a fixed number of days – either six weeks (42 days) or seven weeks (49 days). Total quantity produced per square foot is similar for both slow and fast growing breeds. Given the data in figure 1, this result might appear counter-intuitive. However, note on day 42, slow growth broiler breeds weigh 4.4 and 4 lbs/broiler whereas the faster growing breeds weigh 6.2 and 6.3 lbs/broiler. Given that stocking density is defined by the National Chicken Council

(2017b) as a maximum of 8.5 lbs/ft^2, this implies on day 42 there can be 8.5/4.4 = 1.92 and 8.5/4 = 2.14 broilers/ft^2 for the two slow growth breeds but only 8.5/6.2 = 1.37 and 8.5/6.3 = 1.35 broilers/ft^2 for the two fast growth breeds. Thus, in this scenario, there is similar output produced per square foot because there are more slower growth broilers per square foot than fast growth broilers when stocking density is defined on a weight basis.

Despite similar quantity produced, Table 1 shows that costs are about \$4 to \$5/ft^2 higher for slow growth breeds than the fast-growth breeds at 42 days, which falls to a difference of about \$2.70 to \$3.70/ft^2 at 49 days. Production costs range from \$0.10/lb to \$0.16/lb higher (or 27% on average) higher for the faster than slower growing breeds at 42 days, falling to \$0.08/lb to \$0.13/lb higher (or 24% on average higher) at 49 days. Net partial returns are \$4.04 to \$7.07 per square foot lower for the two slow growing breeds relative to the best performing fast growing breed, Cobb 500 if all broilers are fed for 42 days. The results indicate that the slow growing breeds would need to obtain \$0.118 to \$0.181/lb higher output price premiums to achieve the same net partial return as the Cobb 500 if fed 42 days and \$0.100 to \$0.158/lb higher output price premiums if fed 49 days.

Given the data in figure 1 showing substantial differences in the rate of gain across the different breeds, it is also instructive to compare the different breeds when final weight is used as an end-point. These data are shown in table 2. Table 2 shows it takes 54, 59, 42, and 41 days for the Ranger Gold, Ranger Classic, Ross 308, and Cobb 500 breeds to reach a live weight of 6 lbs. When flocks of each breeds are feed to 6 lbs, the total production, on a dress-weight basis, is about 41lbs/ft^2/year for the faster growing breeds vs. only about 32lbs/ft^2/year for the slower-growing breeds. Costs of production on a square footage basis are higher for fast than slow growth chickens, but the higher weights of fast growth broilers more than offsets for the higher cost. Costs of production are \$0.514/lb and \$0.543/lb for the slower growing breeds as compared to \$0.477/lb and \$0.470/lb for the faster growing breeds. Thus, production costs are about 12% higher per pound for the two slow growing breeds compared to the best performing fast growing breed. Partial returns range from about \$3.49 to \$6.06/ft^2/year higher for the faster vs. slower growing breeds. The slow growing breeds would have to obtain \$0.125 to \$0.197/lb higher output price premiums to achieve the same partial return as the Cobb 500, whereas the Ross 308 achieves almost exactly the same partial return at the same output price.

Table 3 shows the outcomes when, for each of the 225 price data points, the optimal number of days is chosen for each breed. Table 3 also shows that, across the 225 monthly price observations, the number of days on feed that maximizes partial returns per square foot is higher, at about 51 and 55 days, for the slower growing breeds than the 42 and 41 days for the faster growing breeds. As would be expected, owing to the fact that that this is the outcome being maximized, the average partial returns are higher in table 3 than in table 1 or 2. Net partial returns for slow growth broilers are \$8.41 to \$10.20/ft^2/year increasing to \$13.64/ft^2/year and \$14.38/ft^2/year for the fastest growing breeds. Costs of production average \$0.54 for the two slow growth breeds and average \$0.47/lb for the two fast growth breeds, implying costs are 14% higher per pound for the slower growth breeds.

Table 4 considers the outcomes with the optimal number of days is chosen for each breed but where the stocking density is 6 lbs/ft^2 for the slow growth breeds. Stocking density of the two fast growth breeds is held constant at 8.5 lbs/ft^2, and thus the last two columns of table 4 are identical to the last to columns of table 3, and are repeated for ease of comparison. Figure 2 shows the associated net partial returns averaged across the 225 price observations for each of the four broiler breeds for broilers fed 0 to 70 days. As figure 2 shows (see also table 4), the optimal days on feed for the two slow growth breeds are 51 and 55 days, indicating the change in stocking density did not substantially affect feeding times. Although optimal feeding times were not much affected, comparing tables 3 and 4 shows that total production fell about 10 lbs/ft^2 when stocking density was constrained for slow growth broilers. However, because costs per square foot also fell, costs per pound were not substantially affected. As in table 4, costs of production average $0.54 for the two slow growth breeds and average $0.47/lb for the two fast growth breeds, implying costs are 14% higher per pound for the slower growth breeds. The constraint on stocking density had a substantial effect on profitability. Whereas the break-even price premiums for slow growth were $0.12/lb and $0.18/lb in table 3 when stocking density per pound was held constant, these increase to $0.29 and $0.36/lb when stocking density for slow growth broilers is constrained to 6 lbs/ft^2.

Market Impacts

The cost estimates reported in tables 1 through 4 are used to specify the size of the supply shock that would result if the entire industry transitioned from fast to slow growth broiler breeds. For simplicity in what follows, the effects across the two slow growth breeds are averaged and are compared to the average of the two faster growing breeds. For example, in table 1, at 42 days on feed, the average cost of the two slow growth breeds is $0.60/lb and the average cost of the two fast growing breeds is $0.47/lb. This implies that the supply shock is k = (0.60-0.47)/0.47=0.27 for this scenario. Similar calculations imply proportionate increases in marginal cost of 0.24 when all broilers are fed for a fixed 49 days; for simplicity, we utilize k=0.25 for the two scenarios when broilers are fed to a constant number of days on feed. When broiler are fed to a constant weight of six pounds, the average cost increase when moving from slow to fast broilers is about 12% per pound. Finally, both tables 3 and 4 suggest k = 0.14 when partial returns are optimized.

Table 5 reports the result from the model outlined in equations (8)-(11). Under the scenario that all broilers are fed for a constant amount of time, converting to slow growth breeds would increase retail prices by about 2.09% and reduce the amount of retail chicken sold by 1.63%, resulting in losses in producer surplus of $6.23 billion/year and reduced consumer surplus of $1.12 billion/year. When partial returns are maximized, the estimated consumer and producer losses are $0.63 billion/year and $3.5 billion/year, respectively.

The price and welfare changes shown in table 5 presume that consumer demand for chicken remains unchanged after a conversion to slow growth. However, consumers might prefer slower growing varieties due to perceived taste, human health benefits or animal health and welfare benefits (Lusk, 2018), which might also result in an outward demand shift for chicken after such a conversion. The bottom row of table 5 reports the change in consumer willingness-to-pay that would be needed to offset producer losses resulting from the higher production costs. The willingness-to-pay increases range from 7.29% when a target end weight is used to 15.18% when a target number of days on feed is used.

Conclusions

This research considered the potential costs of the broiler industry moving from slow- to fast-growth breeds. The results indicate that a conversion to slow growth is likely to increase production costs by about 12%, 14%, and 25% when producers target a fixed weight, optimize partial returns, and target a fixed number of days on feed, respectively. These cost estimates do not include new fixed costs that might be required for additional production facilities. For example, under the most likely scenario where net returns are optimized and differential stocking densities are applied to slow and fast growth breeds, about 17.45 lbs/ft^2/year (or 73%) more chicken on a dressed weight basis is provided by fast vs. slow growth productions systems. Thus, substantially more barn space, or square footage, would be required to produce the same volume of chicken from slow as compared to fast growth breeds.

In evaluating the economic impacts of slow vs fast growth breeds, two comparisons are made here, and it is important to distinguish between them given the differences in what these values represent. First, we evaluate changes in production costs and corresponding break-even price premiums to the producer. These values represent a scenario where an individual producer (assumed to be a price taker) converts to a slow-growth broiler production system. In this case, the wholesale market price for broilers remains unchanged, and thus the break-even price premium is the additional value ($/lb) that the producer would have to receive to offset the cost increase associated with producing the slower growing broilers. Break-even premiums ranged from $0.10 to $0.36/lb depending on the scenario considered. Under the most likely scenario where net returns are optimized and differential stocking densities are applied to slow and fast growth breeds, we calculate that the two slow growth breeds would need to achieve $0.285/lb and $0.363/lb price premiums to produce the same net partial returns as the highest performing fast-growth breed. To put these figures in perspective, note that the average wholesale price for broilers over the time period studied here was $0.81/lb, suggesting required breakeven price premiums of about 35% to 45%. The estimated break-even price premiums are larger than the added costs of slow growth of about 14%. The difference results from the ability of fast-growth broiler breeds to provide much more output for a given level of costs. Additionally, overall net partial returns are greatly reduced in scenarios where slow-growth broilers are used in conjunction with lower stocking densities given reductions in production, resulting in the higher break-even premiums.

The second comparison made here uses the relative cost changes for producing slow-growth broilers to inform a partial equilibrium model that estimates the market impacts of an industry-wide shift away from modern breeds to slow growth breeds. That is, the relative cost increase represents the supply shock that would result if the entire industry transitioned from fast to slow growth broiler breeds, resulting in estimates of market-level impacts on equilibrium wholesale broiler and retail chicken prices and quantities, and subsequently producer and consumer surplus. However, losses in producer surplus can be offset if consumers are willing to pay premiums for chicken from slow-growth broilers. Lusk (2018) estimated median consumer willingness-to-pay premiums for chicken breasts of \$0.46/lb when chicken packages included brand images and consumers were provided no additional information about slow-growth chicken; this figure increased to \$0.54/lb when positive information was provided and fell to \$0.26/lb when negative information was provided. At retail chicken breast price of \$3.20/lb (the U.S. average in 2017 according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics), a \$0.46/lb premium amounts to a 14.3% willingness to pay above market prices.

Although a 14.3% willingness-to-pay premium is larger than the estimated 8.5% willingness-to-pay increase needed to offset the added producer costs of an industry-wide conversion to slow growth in this study, some caveats are in order. First, whether these estimated willingness-to-pay price premiums from surveys would translate into retail behavior is unclear, particularly because the analysis in Lusk (2018) also showed consumers were very unfamiliar with slow growth chicken in particular and with broiler production in general. Second, prior consumer research focused on consumer demand for chicken breast, the highest value cut on the chicken carcass; whether the willingness-to-pay premiums for slow growth for chicken legs, wings, etc. are as high is uncertain. Regardless, the added cost of slow-growth applies to the entire carcass. Saitone, Sexton, and Sumner (2015) consider cases when consumers are willing to pay premiums for only a part of a carcass with an advertised characteristic. Finally, there is substantial heterogeneity across consumers (see Lusk, 2018), and average impacts are likely to mask the fact that some consumers will gain and others would lose were retailers to pledge to convert to slow growth.

References

Aviagen. 2018a. Ranger Classic Broiler Performance Objectives. Publication 0118-RC-006. pp 1-15. Available online at: http://eu.aviagen.com/tech-center/download/1186/RangerClassic-Broiler-PO-18-EN.pdf Last accessed October 16, 2018.

Aviagen. 2018b. Ranger Gold Broiler Performance Objectives. Publication 0118-RG-004. pp 1-15. Available online at: http://eu.aviagen.com/tech-center/download/1186/RangerClassic-Broiler-PO-18-EN.pdf Last accessed October 16, 2018.

Aviagen. 2014. Ross 308 Broiler: Performance Objectives. Publication 0814-AVNR-033. pp 1-15. Available online at: http://en.aviagen.com/assets/Tech_Center/Ross_Broiler/Ross-308-Broiler-PO-2014-EN.pdf Last accessed October 16, 2018.

Carlsson F., Frykblom, P., Lagerkvist, C.J.. 2007. Consumer willingness to pay for farm animal welfare: mobile abattoirs versus transportation to slaughter. European Review of Agricultural Economics. 34:321-344.

Charles D. 2016. Why whole foods wants a slower-growing chicken. National Public Radio. March 30. https://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2016/03/30/472167748/why-whole-foods-wants-a-slower-growing-chicken. Last accessed October 22, 2018.

Cobb-Vantress. 2015. Broiler Performance & Nutrition Supplement: Cobb500. Publication L-2114-07 EN. pp 1-14. http://www.cobb-vantress.com/docs/default-source/cobb-500-guides/Cobb500_Broiler_Performance_And_Nutrition_Supplement.pdf Last accessed October 16, 2018.

de Jong I., Berg C., Butterworth A., Estevéz, I.. 2012. Scientific report updating the EFSA opinions on the welfare of broilers and broiler breeders. Supporting Publications EN-295. Accessed Jun. 12, 2018. www.efsa.europa.eu/publications

Elanco Animal Health. 2016. The sustainability impacts of slow-growing broiler production in the US. August. Accessed October 22, 2018. https://www.nationalchickencouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Slow-Grow-Broiler-Policy-Sustainability-Impacts-07Oct16.pdf

European Chicken Commitment (2018). http://welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/. Last accessed October 22, 2018.

European Council. 2007. "Laying Down Minimum Rules for the Protection of Chickens Kept for Meat Production." Official Journal of the European Union. Council Directive 2007/43/EC, L 182/19, June 28. Available online at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:182:0019:0028:EN:PDF. Last accessed October 22, 2018.

Gallet, C.A., 2010. Meat meets meta: a quantitative review of the price elasticity of meat. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 92(1), pp.258-272.

Goodwin Jr, H.L., Ahrendsen, B.L., Barton, T.L. and Denton, J.H., 2005. Estimated returns for contract broiler production in Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma: Historical and future perspectives. Journal of applied poultry research, 14(1), pp.106-115.

Global Animal Partnership. 2018. "5-Step Animal Welfare Rating Standards for Chickens Raised for Meat v3.1." April 3. Available online at: https://globalanimalpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/GAP-Standard-for-Meat-Chickens-v3.1-20180403.pdf Last accessed October 22, 2018.

Holt, M.T. and McKenzie, A.M., 2003. Quasi-rational and ex ante price expectations in commodity supply models: an empirical analysis of the US broiler market. Journal of applied econometrics, 18(4), pp.407-426.

Lusk, J.L. and Anderson, J.D., 2004. Effects of country-of-origin labeling on meat producers and consumers. Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics, pp.185-205.

Lusk, J.L., 2013. Role of technology in the global economic importance and viability of animal protein production. Animal Frontiers, 3(3), pp.20-27.

Lusk, J.L., 2018. Consumer preferences for and beliefs about slow growth chicken. Poultry Science. forthcoming https://doi.org/10.3382/ps/pey301

MacDonald, J.M. 2014. Technology, Organization, and Financial Performance in U.S. Broiler Production. USDA Economic Research Service, Economic Information Bulletin Number 126, June.

Napolitano F., Castellini C., Naspetti S., Piasentier E., Girolami A., Braghieri A.. 2013. Consumer preference for chicken breast may be more affected by information on organic production than by product sensory properties. Poultry Science. 92:820-826.

National Chicken Council. 2018. U.S. Broiler Performance, 1925 to Present. https://www.nationalchickencouncil.org/about-the-industry/statistics/u-s-broiler-performance/ Last accessed October 16, 2018.

National Chicken Council. Slow growth chicken environmental impact., 2017a, Available online at https://www.nationalchickencouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ChickenUsaOneThirdInfoGraphic.jpg. Last accessed October 22, 2018.

National Chicken Council. 2017b. Animal Welfare Guidelines and Audit Checklist for Broilers. February 2. Available online at: https://www.nationalchickencouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/NCC-Welfare-Guidelines-Broilers.pdf. Last accessed October 24, 2018.

Rhodes, J.L., J. Timmons, J.R. Nottingham, and W. Musser. 2011. "Broiler Production Management for Potential and Existing Growers." University of Maryland Extension https://extension.umd.edu/sites/extension.umd.edu/files/_docs/POULTRY_BroilerProductionManagement_final1.pdf

Saitone, T.L., Sexton, R.J. and Sumner, D.A., 2015. What happens when food marketers require restrictive farming practices?. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 97(4), pp.1021-1043.

Sanotra G.S., Lund J.D., Ersbøll A.K., Petersen J.S., Vestergaard K.S.. 2001. Monitoring leg problems in broilers: a survey of commercial broiler production in Denmark. Worlds Poultry Science Journal. 57:55-69.

SCAHAW. 2000. The welfare of chickens kept for meat production (broilers). Scientific Committee in Animal Health and Animal Welfare. European Commission, Health and Consumer Protection Directorate General, Brussels, Belgium.

Strom S.. 2017. A chicken that grows slower and tastes better. New York Times, May 1. Accessed Jun. 12, 2018. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/01/dining/chicken-perdue-slow-growth-breed.html

Trotter, G. 2018. "Groups turn up pressure on McDonald's chicken policies: 'It's just not right'". Chicago Tribune. March, 25. Available online at: http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/ct-biz-mcdonalds-chicken-welfare-policy-20180315-story.html. Last accessed October 22, 2018.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. 2018a. Agricultural Productivity in the U.S. Available online at: https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/agricultural-productivity-in-the-us/ Last accessed October 16, 2018.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. 2018b. Food Availability (Per Capita) Data System. Available online at: https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/food-availability-per-capita-data-system/ Last accessed October 16, 2018.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. 2018c. Meat Price Spreads. Available online at: https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/meat-price-spreads/ Last accessed October 16, 2018.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. 2018. Quick Stats 2.0. Washington DC. https://quickstats.nass.usda.gov/. Last accessed October 16, 2018.

Wohlgenant, M.K., 1989. Demand for farm output in a complete system of demand functions. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 71(2), pp.241-252.

Wohlgenant, M.K., 1993. Distribution of gains from research and promotion in multi-stage production systems: The case of the US beef and pork industries. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 75(3), pp.642-651.

Wohlgenant, M.K., 2011. Consumer demand and welfare in equilibrium displacement models. The Oxford Handbook of the Economics of Food Consumption and Policy, J.L. Lusk, J. Roosen, and J. Shogren, eds. pp.292-318.



Figure 1. Growth Curves for Commercial Slow and Fast Growing Broiler Breeds



Figure 2. Average Partial Return by Day on Feed for Commercial Slow and Fast Growing Broiler Breeds

Table 1. Relative Performance of Slow Growth Broilers Fed for Fixed Number of Days

Outcome	Slow 1: Ranger Classic	Slow 2: Ranger Gold	Fast 1: Ross 308	Fast 2: Cobb 500
Six Weeks				
Days on feed (days/bird)	42	42	42	42
Production (lbs/ft^2/year)	40.305	39.054	40.684	41.277
Cost (\$/ft^2/year)	23.154[a] (3.678)[b]	24.465 (3.645)	19.419 (3.642)	19.195 (3.617)
Cost (\$/lb)	0.574 (0.091)	0.626 (0.093)	0.477 (0.09)	0.465 (0.088)
Partial Return (\$/ft^2/year)	9.456 (4.101)	7.133 (3.963)	13.497 (4.15)	14.201 (4.223)
Break Even Premium (\$/lb) relative to best performer	0.118 (0.005)	0.181 (0.009)	0.017 (0.003)	---
Seven Weeks				
Days on feed (days/bird)	49	49	49	49
Production (lbs/ft^2/year)	36.328	35.122	36.669	37.329
Cost (\$/ft^2/year)	19.326 (3.495)	20.276 (3.464)	16.636 (3.506)	16.503 (3.492)
Cost (\$/lb)	0.532 (0.096)	0.577 (0.099)	0.454 (0.096)	0.442 (0.094)
Partial Return (\$/ft^2/year)	10.066 (3.676)	8.141 (3.547)	13.032 (3.712)	13.700 (3.787)
Break Even Premium (\$/lb) relative to best performer	0.100 (0.004)	0.158 (0.009)	0.018 (0.003)	---

[a]Mean calculated across 225 monthly observations of input and output prices from January 2000 to September 2018.
[b]Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations

Table 2. Relative Performance of Slow Growth Broilers at Fixed Final Weight (6 lb broiler)

Outcome	Slow 1: Ranger Classic	Slow 2: Ranger Gold	Fast 1: Ross 308	Fast 2: Cobb 500
Days on feed (days/bird)	54	59	42	41
Production (lbs/ft^2/year)	33.934	30.723	40.684	41.922
Cost (\$/ft^2/year)	17.451[a] (3.380)[b]	16.684 (3.246)	19.419 (3.642)	19.689 (3.635)
Cost (\$/lb)	0.514 (0.100)	0.543 (0.106)	0.477 (0.09)	0.470 (0.087)
Partial Return (\$/ft^2/year)	10.005 (3.425)	8.174 (3.096)	13.497 (4.15)	14.230 (4.296)
Break Even Premium (\$/lb) relative to best performer	0.125 (0.029)	0.197 (0.045)	0.018 (0.005)	---

[a]Mean calculated across 225 monthly observations of input and output prices from January 2000 to September 2018.
[b]Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations

Table 3. Relative Performance of Slow Growth Broilers at Optimal Days on Feed with Identical Stocking Densities across Breeds

Outcome	Slow 1: Ranger Classic	Slow 2: Ranger Gold	Fast 1: Ross 308	Fast 2: Cobb 500
Days on feed (days/bird)	50.880[a]	54.529	41.902	41.111
	(4.340)[b]	(4.841)	(3.417)	(3.643)
Production (lbs/ft^2/year)	35.516	32.682	40.871	42.001
	(2.162)	(2.141)	(2.216)	(2.344)
Cost ($/ft^2/year)	18.833	18.331	19.744	19.931
	(4.593)	(4.459)	(4.941)	(5.030)
Cost ($/lb)	0.526	0.556	0.479	0.470
	(0.108)	(0.112)	(0.102)	(0.100)
Partial Return ($/ft^2/year)	10.203	8.409	13.640	14.384
	(3.704)	(3.411)	(4.281)	(4.419)
Break Even Premium ($/lb)	0.117	0.181	0.018	---
relative to best performer	(0.016)	(0.023)	(0.003)	

[a]Mean calculated across 225 monthly observations of input and output prices from January 2000 to September 2018.
[b]Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations

Table 4. Relative Performance of Slow Growth Broilers at Optimal Days on Feed with Breed-Specific Stocking Densities

Outcome	**Slow 1: Ranger Classic**	**Slow 2: Ranger Gold**	**Fast 1: Ross 308**	**Fast 2: Cobb 500**
Days on feed (days/bird)	50.947[a] (4.353)[b]	54.560 (4.864)	41.902 (3.417)	41.111 (3.643)
Production (lbs/ft^2/year)	25.048 (1.527)	23.061 (1.516)	40.871 (2.216)	42.001 (2.344)
Cost ($/ft^2/year)	13.301 (3.242)	12.956 (3.150)	19.744 (4.941)	19.931 (5.030)
Cost ($/lb)	0.527 (0.108)	0.557 (0.112)	0.479 (0.102)	0.470 (0.100)
Partial Return ($/ft^2/year)	7.178 (2.613)	5.912 (2.406)	13.640 (4.281)	14.384 (4.419)
Break Even Premium ($/lb) relative to best performer	0.285 (0.054)	0.363 (0.063)	0.018 (0.003)	---

[a]Mean calculated across 225 monthly observations of input and output prices from January 2000 to September 2018.
[b]Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations

Table 5. Market Outcomes Associated with Full Conversion to Slow Growth Under Four Scenarios

	Scenario		
Outcome	**Feed to Constant # Days**	**Feed to Constant Weight**	**Optimize Net Returns**
Change in marginal cost, k	25%	12%	14%
Change in retail chicken quantity, $\hat{Q}$	-1.63%	-0.78%	-0.91%
Change in retail chicken price, $\hat{P}$	2.09%	1.00%	1.17%
Change in broiler quantity, $\hat{x}$	-1.80%	-0.86%	-1.01%
Change in broiler price, $\hat{w}$	3.80%	1.83%	2.13%
Change in consumer surplus (billion $/year)	-1.12	-0.54	-0.63
Change in producer surplus (billion $/year)	-6.23	-3.01	-3.50
Increase in consumer willingness-to-pay for chicken needed to offset producer losses	15.18%	7.29%	8.50%