TABLE 17.—LIVESTOCK FARMS IN SUBREGION 109, BY ECONOMIC CLASS OF FARM: 1954

Item	Total	Economic class of farm					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Number of farms	12,549	1,171	2,003	2,741	2,754	2,400	1,480
Percent distribution	100.0	9.3	16.0	21.8	21.9	19.1	11.8
Livestock, average number per farm:							
Cattle	145	532	256	127	73	41	23
Sheep	221	1,666	198	74	47	26	18
Animal units	189	866	296	142	83	46	27
Animal units, total	2,373,904	1,013,675	592,197	389,830	227,849	110,666	39,686
Percent distribution	100.0	42.7	24.9	16.4	9.6	4.7	1.7
Man-equivalent per farm	2.0	6.9	2.4	1.6	1.3	1.0	1.2
Animal units per man-equivalent	95	125	124	88	65	45	23
Hired labor per farm dollars	1,687	11,139	2,213	762	345	195	123
Hired labor per animal unit dollars	8.92	12.87	7.48	5.36	4.17	4.22	4.68
Investment in land and buildings per animal unit dollars	279	232	279	305	336	433	461
Value of land and buildings, per farm dollars	52,704	201,273	82,516	43,347	27,909	19,924	12,460
Value of livestock per farm dollars	17,571	77,850	27,673	13,541	7,994	4,511	2,673
Value of land and buildings and livestock per farm dollars	70,275	279,123	110,189	56,888	35,903	24,435	15,133
Value of all farm products sold per farm dollars	10,967	61,201	15,321	7,133	3,718	1,818	758
Livestock and livestock products sales as a percent of value of all farm products sold	93.7	95.7	92.4	89.7	91.7	92.7	90.7

The Intermountain Region

Economic subregion 110.—This economic subregion consists of the plateaus of the Columbia River in Washington and Oregon, the Palouse Hills of eastern Washington, and the Panhandle of Idaho. Within this subregion are important wheat-farming area and irrigation developments. Livestock ranching is relatively less important here than in most subregions in the West.

TABLE 18.—LIVESTOCK FARMS IN SUBREGION 110, BY ECONOMIC CLASS OF FARM: 1954

Item	Total	Economic class of farm					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Number of farms	1,489	128	174	231	347	340	269
Percent distribution	100.0	8.6	11.7	15.5	23.3	22.8	18.1
Livestock, average number per farm:							
Cattle	107	486	191	124	55	32	22
Sheep	109	1,141	17	15	21	4	1
Animal units	129	714	194	127	59	33	22
Animal units, total	192,361	91,440	33,812	20,303	20,632	11,202	5,973
Percent distribution	100.0	47.5	17.6	15.2	10.7	5.8	3.1
Man-equivalent per farm	1.5	5.0	1.9	1.5	1.0	0.8	1.0
Animal units per man-equivalent	88	143	102	87	57	42	23
Hired labor per farm dollars	1,431	10,525	1,979	1,166	266	171	71
Hired labor per animal unit dollars	11.07	14.73	10.18	9.19	4.47	5.19	3.19
Investment in land and buildings per animal unit dollars	360	342	329	363	487	427	741
Value of land and buildings, per farm dollars	46,395	244,508	63,783	46,143	28,759	14,098	16,310
Value of livestock per farm dollars	12,654	66,101	19,639	13,244	6,126	3,363	2,364
Value of land and buildings and livestock per farm dollars	59,049	310,609	83,422	59,387	34,885	17,461	18,674
Value of all farm products sold per farm dollars	11,273	78,365	16,249	7,634	3,763	1,903	783
Livestock and livestock products sales as a percent of value of all farm products sold	86.0	86.0	83.4	86.6	88.6	87.6	89.7

The average size stock ranch here is rather small and there is a high concentration of livestock numbers on Classes I and II ranches (see Table 18). This probably is due to the fact that there is a considerable number of large sheep-ranching operations. These large ranches have a relatively high labor efficiency, and the amount of labor used on the smaller units is unusually high.

The investment in land and buildings per animal unit is below the average of western subregions and is generally comparable with that in the northern plains subregions and in the Rocky Mountain subregions.

Economic subregion 111.—This subregion consists of the central part of the State of Washington (see Figure 10). It is, principally, the drainage areas of the Okanogan and Yakima Rivers. Though this is not primarily a stock-ranching territory, the Okanogan Country does have a considerable number of stock ranches.

This subregion has essentially the same characteristics as the stock ranches in other subregions. Man-labor per unit of livestock averages relatively high for the stock ranches. Land and buildings investment per animal unit averages somewhat below the general average for the West (see Table 19).

TABLE 19.—LIVESTOCK FARMS IN SUBREGION 111, BY ECONOMIC CLASS OF FARM: 1954

Item	Total	Economic class of farm					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Number of farms	1,461	168	197	291	345	393	67
Percent distribution	100.0	11.5	13.5	19.9	23.6	26.9	4.6
Livestock, average number per farm:							
Cattle	118	389	216	99	51	42	29
Sheep	65	400	51	33	17	6	4
Animal units	131	469	226	105	54	43	29
Animal units, total	191,722	78,857	44,577	30,662	18,647	17,011	1,973
Percent distribution	100.0	41.1	23.2	16.0	9.7	8.9	1.0
Man-equivalent per farm	1.5	3.5	1.8	1.3	1.1	0.9	1.0
Animal units per man-equivalent	89	133	124	79	50	46	29
Hired labor per farm dollars	1,377	6,685	1,912	900	312	349	92
Hired labor per animal unit dollars	10.50	14.24	8.45	8.54	5.77	8.06	3.12
Investment in land and buildings per animal unit dollars	327	279	258	321	442	489	745
Value of land and buildings, per farm dollars	42,777	130,665	58,344	33,685	23,892	21,040	21,611
Value of livestock per farm dollars	13,067	45,666	22,394	10,822	5,532	4,423	3,152
Value of land and buildings and livestock per farm dollars	55,844	176,331	80,738	44,507	29,424	25,463	24,763
Value of all farm products sold per farm dollars	13,390	74,502	14,716	7,061	3,924	1,742	814
Livestock and livestock products sales as a percent of value of all farm products sold	90.3	91.9	87.9	84.3	87.0	96.3	74.8

Economic subregion 112.—This includes the Snake River Valley and the Snake River plains of Idaho, and northern and central Utah. Some very important irrigation developments occur within it but except for these, the main type of agriculture is stock ranching. In the upper parts of the Snake River Valley stock ranching is associated closely with irrigated farming. In the other parts there is not much association between stock ranching and irrigated farming.

The number of animal units of livestock handled per man-year averages rather low even on Classes I and II stock ranches. This situation probably is explained by (*1*) the larger number of family workers per ranch, (*2*) winter feeding, and (*3*) the movement of livestock in many instances from the farm to the feeding area or from feeding area to feeding area. Investment in land and buildings is below the average for the stock ranches in the West (see Table 20).