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Introduction

A survey of the sheep industry in Indiana was compiled for each county during the period December 1964 to February 1965. This survey was conducted in conjunction with the state and federal sheep scabies inspections held during these months. A summary of this survey for the state of Indiana was reported in Research Progress Report 195 and included in the Annual Indiana Sheep Day Report of June 12, 1965.

Using the raw data obtained from each county, Donald E. Greene of Route 1, Linton, Greene County, Indiana, who was a student in the Sheep Production class at Purdue University during the spring of 1966, compiled a report showing a county by county comparison of the information obtained in this survey. The following is a summary of the important comparisons contained in this report. When no information was reported, the figures for that county were omitted.

Distribution of Total Sheep

In 1965, Indiana had a total of 14,762 flocks of sheep. Information was obtained on 14,617 breeding flocks totaling 327,327 sheep with an average flock size of 22.4 sheep, including ewes and rams. Figure 1 shows the distribution of breeding sheep by counties. The top figure in each county indicates the total number of breeding sheep, the middle figure, the number of flocks and the lower figure, the average size of the flocks.

Most of the breeding sheep are located in the northeastern part of the state from Decatur, Shelby and Johnson counties on the south and Putnam, Montgomery, Fountain, Benton and Jasper counties on the west. Forty-three counties in this area had 251,054 or 76.7 per cent of the breeding sheep and 10,952 flocks or 75 per cent of the flocks.

The top five counties in numbers of breeding sheep are given in Table 1.

Distribution of Breeding Ewes

Of the 327,327 breeding sheep, 274,642 were ewes. Of this number, 250,224 or 91 per cent were commercial native or commercial western ewes and 24,418 or 9 per cent were registered ewes. Figure 2 shows the distribution of breeding ewes by counties. The top figure indicates the number of registered ewes, the middle figure is the number of commercial native ewes, and the bottom figure is the number of commercial western ewes in each county. In general, the distribution follows the same pattern.

Table 1. Top five counties by number of breeding sheep

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>No. Breeding Sheep</th>
<th>No. Flocks</th>
<th>Av. No./flocks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>10,367</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>8,560</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Kalb</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko</td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>7,824</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2. Top five counties by number of registered, commercial native, and commercial western ewes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>No. Breeding Ewes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered Ewes</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tippecanoe</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Native Ewes</td>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>7813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>6703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kosciusko</td>
<td>6394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>5955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De Kalb</td>
<td>5516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Western Ewes</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>1434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as that of the breeding sheep. The average flock size was 20, 19 and 45 respectively for the registered, commercial native and commercial western ewes.

The top five counties in numbers of each of these groups is given in Table 2.

Distribution of Rams

The report on the breeds of rams used was obtained from 12,476 flocks. A total of 19,461 rams were used for an average of 1.56 rams per flock. Of this total 3575 (18.4%) were Suffolks, 2655 (13.6%) were Corriedales, 2570 (13.2%) were Hampshires and 1844 (9.5%) were Shropshires. These four breeds accounted for 54.7 per cent of the rams used. Figure 3 shows that two leading breeds of rams used in each county with the number of flocks in which they were used.

Suffolk rams predominated in 38 central and northern counties, Hampshires in 26 southern counties, Corriedales in 18 counties and Shropshires in 6 counties largely in the northeastern section of the state.

Management Practices

Information was obtained on management practices including dipping for control of external parasites, reporting lameness and a worming to control internal parasites.

Dipping was carried out in 30.4 per cent of the flocks in the state within the two previous years, and Figure 4 shows the distribution by counties. The top five counties in percentage of flocks dipped were: Knox, 65.7 per cent; Jay, 63.7 per cent; Johnson, 61.9 per cent; Hamilton, 61.2 per cent and Steuben, 57.4 per cent.

The percentage of lameness reported within the two previous years is shown in Figure 5. Approximately 86 per cent of the flock owners in the state reported no lameness in their sheep in the two previous years. Five counties (Brown, Floyd, Jefferson, Newton, and Spencer) reported no
lameness in the county. Seven counties reported less than 1.5 per cent of the flocks showing lameness. These included: Allen, 0.8 per cent; Steuben, 0.8 per cent; Clay, 1.0 per cent; White, 1.0 per cent; Hancock, 1.1 per cent; Elkhart, 1.3 per cent and Wells, 1.4 per cent. On the other hand, five counties reported that more than 20 per cent of their flocks exhibited lameness in the same period. This indicates the need for constant vigilance in the control of foot rot in all areas of the state.

Approximately 67 per cent of the flocks in the state followed a worming program. Figure 6 shows the percentage of flocks in each county following such a program. The top five counties include: Spencer, 100 per cent; Daviess, 96.5 per cent; Newton, 93.4 per cent; Monroe, 93.3 per cent and Lawrence, 90.7 per cent. Conversely, five counties reported that less than 50 per cent of their flocks followed a worming program.

Utilization of This Report

The information contained in this report may be of value to area livestock specialists, area and county sheep associations and flock owners in assessing the importance of the sheep industry as well as the status of management practices in their counties or areas and aid them in planning their future sheep programs.
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Figure 1. Distribution of Breeding Sheep - 1965.

Top Figure - No. of Breeding Sheep
Middle Figure - No. of Flocks
Lower Figure - Average Size of Flock
Figure 2. Distribution of Breeding Ewes - 1965

Top Figure - No. of Registered Ewes
Middle Figure - No. of Commercial Native Ewes
Lower Figure - No. of Commercial Western Ewes
Figure 3. Predominate Breeds of Rams - 1965.

Key to Breeds
Ch - Cheviot
Cl - Columbia
Co - Corriedale
Do - Dorset
Ha - Hampshire
Mo - Montadale
Sh - Shropshire
So - Southdown
Su - Suffolk

Figures indicate number of flocks
Figure 4. Control of External Parasites.

Figures indicate percentage of flocks following a dipping program, 1962-1964.
Figure 5. Lameness in Flocks.

Figures indicate percentage of flocks showing lameness, 1962-1964.
Figures indicate percentage of flocks having a worming program, 1962-1964.