ARIZONA – NEW MEXICO DAIRY NEWSLETTER

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

MAY, 2003

This month's article:

Managing Bunker, Trench, and Drive-over Pile Silages for Optimum Nutritive Value: Five Important Practices

Keith K. Bolsen

(Reprinted from the Southwest Nutrition and Management Conference, February 20 & 21, 2003)

The Arizona New Mexico Dairy Newsletter is now available on the following websites:

University of Arizona Animal Sciences Website:
http://animal.cals..arizona.edu/confandnews/
and
New Mexico State University Extension Dairy Website:
http://www/nmsu.edu/~dairy

New Mexico State University Extension Dairy Website:
http://www/nmsu.edu/~dairy

The following videos are available for checkout from New Mexico State University. To obtain a video call Kathy Bustos, (505) 646-3326 or kbustos@nmsu.edu and the video will be sent in the mail, pending availability. There is only one copy of each video available, so we request that videos be returned within two weeks. Note that four of the videos contain an English and Spanish version.

1. The Milking School. Utah State University. Spanish and English. 30 minutes
2. Fitting and Showing Your Dairy Animal....A Winning Experience. Department of Dairy Science, University of Wisconsin. 20 minutes
3. Proper Milking Procedure. University of Florida. Spanish and English. 12 minutes
4. Milking Machine Maintenance. University of Florida. Spanish and English. 16 minutes
5. The Basics of Vacuum and Milking Systems. DHIA Services, 1991. 53 minutes
6. Understanding Dairy Cattle Behavior to Improve Handling and Production. Livestock Conservation Institute, 1992
7. Managing Milking/Ordenar Lecheria. Spanish and English. 1999. 33 minutes
8. Get Milk! Joining A Dairy Crew. University of New Hampshire, 1999. 45 minutes

Need to Calculate Production Costs?

University of Wisconsin dairy farm management specialist, Gary Frank, has developed a Excel spreadsheet to calculate variable cost of production and total cost of production. To access the spreadsheet, go to http://www.wisc.edu/dairy-profit, click on Decision Making Tools, then go to costcwt.xls.

University of Arizona
Department of Animal Sciences
P O Box 210038, Shantz Bldg, Room 205
Tucson, AZ 85721

New Mexico State University
Extension Animal Resources
Box 30003 Dept. 3AE
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Managing Bunker, Trench, and Drive-over Pile Silages for Optimum Nutritive Value: Five Important Practices

Keith K. Bolsen

Department of Animal Sciences and Industry,
Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506-0201
phone: 785-532-1222, fax: 785-532-7059, email: kbolsen@oznet.ksu.edu

The points of the silage triangle are represented by persons responsible for (1) the dairy cattle, (2) the forage, and (3) the harvesting process. In some dairy operations, one person is responsible for all three points. But in many instances, both growing and harvesting (and ensiling) the crop are done completely on a contract basis, creating a situation where a different person is at each point of the triangle. When communication between the points of the triangle is ineffective, inefficiencies can result, which directly affect the bottom line.

Although a dairy cattle operation's nutritionist – often an outside consultant – is not a direct part of the triangle, he or she has an obvious vested interest in how well the triangle performs. The nutritionist might be the key person in assuring effective communication between the triangle's three points.

The nutritionist's major responsibility is generally to the dairy cattle point of the triangle, so among his/her major responsibilities could be (1) educating the client about proper silage management, and (2) fostering communication. Ideally, the nutritionist should moderate an annual meeting between the dairy manager, the forage crop grower, and the custom harvester. This can ensure that all involved understand and agree regarding expectations and implementation of the entire silage program. In other cases, a small dairy producer might be on the wrong end of a tight supply/demand situation and therefore lack the economic power to make demands on the crop grower and/or custom harvester. Then, the nutritionist must focus directly on the dairy producer, and make sure that the things directly under the producer's control are done correctly.

This paper focuses on five important silage management practices that are in the control of dairy producers and that are sometimes poorly implemented or overlooked entirely. These are (1) using an effective bacterial inoculant, (2) achieving a high silage density, (3) effective sealing, (4) properly managing the feedout face, and (5) discarding spoiled silage.

Use a Bacterial Inoculant

For detailed summaries on the effect of bacterial inoculants on silage fermentation, preservation efficiency, and nutritive value, see reviews by Muck (1993); Kung and Muck (1997); and Muck and Kung (1997).

Evaluation of silage additives began in 1975 in the Department of Animal Sciences and Industry. A summary of results from over 200 laboratory-scale studies, which involved nearly 1,000 silages and 25,000 silos, indicate that bacterial inoculants are beneficial in over 90% of the comparisons. Inoculated silages have faster and more efficient fermentations -- pH is lower, particularly during the first 2 to 4 days of the ensiling process for hay crop forages, and lactic acid content and the lactic to acetic acid ratio are higher than in untreated silages. Inoculated silages also have lower ethanol and ammonia-nitrogen values compared to untreated silages. Results from 28 farm-scale trials, which evaluated 71 silages, showed that bacterial inoculants consistently improved fermentation efficiency, DM recovery, feed to gain ratio, and live weight gain per ton of crop ensiled in both corn and sorghum silages (Bolsen et al., 1992).

Economics of bacterial inoculants. A "bottom line" calculation of the value of inoculating corn silage and alfalfa haylage for dairy cows is presented in Table 2. The dairy herd in this example has an average milk production 87 lbs per cow per day and a daily DM intake of 54.2 lbs (Table 1). The increase in net income, calculated on a per ton of crop ensiled or per cow per day or per cow per year basis, is realized from increases in both preservation and feed utilization improvements. The additional "cow days" per ton of crop ensiled, because of the increased DM recovery, and the increased milk per cow per day from the inoculated silage or haylage (0.25 lbs) produced a $6.67 increase in net return per ton of corn ensiled and a $14.95 increase in net return per ton of alfalfa ensiled.

Recommendations. Why leave the critical fermentation phase to chance by assuming that the epiphytic microorganisms (those occurring naturally on the forage) are going to be effective in preserving the silage crop? Even if a dairy or beef cattle producer's silage has been acceptable in the past--because silage-making conditions in most regions of North America are generally good-- there are always opportunities for improvement.

Although whole-plant corn and sorghum ensile easily, research data clearly show that the quality of the fermentation and subsequent preservation and utilization efficiencies are improved with bacterial inoculants. Alfalfa (and other legumes) are usually difficult to ensile because of a low sugar content and high buffering capacity. However, adding an inoculant helps ensure that as much of the available substrate as possible is converted to lactic acid, which removes some of the risk of having a poorly preserved, low-quality silage.

Finally, if producers already are doing a good job but using a bacterial inoculant for the first time, they probably will not see a dramatic difference in their silage. But the benefit will be there -- additional silage DM recovery and significantly more beef or milk production per ton of crop ensiled.

Table 1. Silage, haylage, and grain mix inputs in the example dairy herd ration.

Ration	Dry matter intake, lbs	Dry matter, %	Amount as-fed, lbs	$ per lb	Daily ration cost, $
Corn silage	11.4	35.0	32.6	0.015	0.49
Alfalfa haylage	11.2	40.0	28.0	0.03	0.84
Grain mix	31.6	87.5	35.1	0.075	2.63
Total	54.2		95.7		3.96

Table 2. Comparison of preservation efficiency and feed utilization efficiency with and without an inoculant.

	Corn silage		Alfalfa haylage	
	Untreated	Inoculant	Untreated	Inoculant
Preservation efficiency:				

Dry matter recovery, %	90.0	91.25	87.5	90.0
Dry matter recovered per ton ensiled, lbs	1800	1825	1750	1800
Amount fed daily, lbs	32.6	32.6	28.0	28.0
"Cow days" per ton ensiled	55.2	56.0 (+0.8)	62.5	64.3 (+1.8)
Milk gained per ton ensiled, lbs		69.6[1]		156.6[5]
Milk value gained per ton ensiled, $		$8.70[2]		$19.57[6]

Utilization efficiency:		
Increased milk yield/cow/day, lbs	Inoculated corn silage = 0.25 lbs increase in milk/cow/day.	Inoculated alfalfa haylage = 0.25 lbs increase in milk/cow/day.
Milk gained per ton of crop ensiled, lbs	56.0 cow days × 0.25 lbs of milk = 14.0 lbs milk gained/ton ensiled.	64.3 cow days × 0.25 lbs of milk = 16.0 lbs milk gained/ton ensiled.
Milk value gained per ton ensiled, $	14.0 lbs of milk × $0.125/lb = $1.75 gained value/ton ensiled.	16.0 lbs of milk × $0.125/lb = $2.00 gained value/ton ensiled.
Combined efficiencies	($8.70 + $1.75) × ($2.78 + $1.00)[3,4] = $6.67 gained value/ton of crop ensiled.	($19.57 + $2.00 × ($5.62 + $1.00)[7,4] = $14.95 gained value/ton of crop ensiled.
Bottom line:		
Additional cost	32.6 lbs × 305 days ÷ 2000 = 5.0 tons/cow/yr. 5.0 tons ÷ 0.9125 = 6.1 tons to ensile/cow/yr[8]. 6.1 tons × $1.00/ton = $6.10/cow/yr. $6.10 ÷ 305 days = $0.02/cow/day.	28.0 lbs × 305 days ÷ 2000 = 4.3 tons/cow/yr. 4.3 tons ÷ 0.90 = 5.3 tons to ensile/cow/yr[8]. 5.3 tons × $1.00/ton = $5.30/cow/yr. $5.30 ÷ 305 days = $0.017/cow/day.
Additional income	5.0 tons × $6.67 = $33.35/cow/yr. $33.35 ÷ 305 days = $0.11/cow/day.	4.3 tons × $14.95 = $64.28/cow/yr. $64.28 ÷305 days = $0.21/cow/day.
Increased net income	$0.11 - $0.02 = $0.09/cow/day. $0.09 × 305 days = $27.45 /cow/yr.	$0.21 - $0.017 = $0.19/cow/day. $0.193 ×305 days = $57.95 /cow/yr.

[1]87.0 lbs of milk/cow/day × 0.8 "cow days" gained per ton ensiled.
[2]69.6 lbs of milk × $0.125 per lb = $8.70 gained value per ton ensiled.
[3]Haylage + grain mix costs/cow/day = $3.47 × 0.8 cow days = $2.78 added cost per ton ensiled.
[4]Treatment (inoculate) cost = $1.00 per ton ensiled.
[5]87.0 lbs of milk/cow/day × 1.8 "cow days" gained per ton ensiled.
[6]156.6 lbs of milk × $0.125 per lb = $19.57 gained value per ton ensiled.
[7]Corn Silage + grain mix costs/cow/day = $3.12 × 1.8 cow day = $5.62 added cost per ton ensiled.

[8]Assumes a 91.25% "forage in" vs. "silage out" for the corn silage; 90.0% for alfalfa haylage. An additional 10 percent was included in the tons ensiled as an inventory insurance protection.

Achieve a Higher Silage Density

First, density and crop dry matter (DM) content determine the porosity of the silage, which affects the rate at which air can enter the silage mass at the feedout face. Second, the higher the density, the greater the capacity of the silo. Thus, higher densities typically reduce the annual storage cost per ton of crop by both increasing the amount of crop entering the silo and reducing crop losses during storage. Recommendations have usually been to spread the chopped forage in thin layers and pack continuously with heavy, single-wheeled tractors. But the factors that affect silage density in a bunker, trench, or drive-over pile silo are not completely understood. Ruppel *et al.* (1995) measured the DM losses in alfalfa silage in bunker silos and developed an equation to relate these losses to the density of the ensiled forage (Table 3). They found that tractor weight and packing time per ton were important factors; however, the variability in density suggested there were other important factors not considered.

In a recent study, Muck and Holmes (1999) measured silage densities over a wide range of bunker silos in Wisconsin, and the densities were correlated with crop/forage characteristics as well as harvesting and filling practices. Samples were collected from 168 bunker silos and a questionnaire completed about how each bunker was filled. Four core samples were taken from each bunker feedout face and core depth, height of the core hole above the floor, and height of silage above the core hole were recorded. Density and particle size distribution were also measured.

The range of DM contents, densities, and average particle size observed in the hay crop and corn silages are shown in Table 4. As expected, the range in DM content was narrower for the corn silages compared to the hay crop silages. The average DM content of the corn silages was in the recommended range of 30-35%. But several of the haylages were too wet (less than 30% DM), which can lead to effluent loss and a clostridial fermentation, or too dry (more than 50% DM), which can lead to extensive heat damage, mold, and the risk of a fire. The average DM density for the hay crop and corn silages was similar and slightly higher than a commonly recommended minimum DM density of 14.0 lbs/ft^3. Some producers were achieving very high DM densities, while others were severely underpacking. One very practical issue was packing time relative to the chopped forage delivery rate to the bunker. Packing time per ton was highest (1 to 4 min/ton on a fresh basis) under low delivery rates (less than 30 tons/h on a fresh basis). Packing times were consistently less than 1 min/ton (on a fresh basis) at delivery rates above 60 tons/hour.

There are several key factors that dairy producers can control to achieve higher densities, which will minimize DM and nutrient losses during ensiling, storage, and feedout.

Forage delivery rate. Reducing the delivery rate is somewhat difficult to accomplish, as very few dairy producers or silage contractors are inclined to slow the harvest rate so that additional packing can be accomplished.

Packing tractor weight. This can be increased by adding weight to the front of the tractor or 3-point hitch and filling the tires with water.

Number of tractors. Adding a second or third packing tractor as delivery rate increases can help keep packing time in the optimum range of 1 to 3 minutes per ton of fresh forage.

Forage layer thickness. Chopped forage should be spread in thin layers (6 to 12 inches). In a properly-packed bunker silo, the tires of the packing tractor should pass over the entire surface before the next forage layer is distributed.

Filling the silo to a greater depth. Greater silage depth increases density, but there are practical limits to the final forage depth in a bunker, trench, or drive-over pile. Safety of employees who operate packing tractors and who unload silage at the feedout face becomes a concern. Packing in bunkers that are filled beyond their capacity and the chance of an avalanch of silage from the feedout face pose serious risks.

Table 3. Dry matter loss as influenced by silage density.

Density (lbs of DM/ft^3)	DM loss at 180 days (% of the DM ensiled)
10	20.2
14	16.8
16	15.1
18	13.4
22	10.0

Table 4. Summary of core sample analysis from the bunker silos

Silage characteristic	Hay crop silage (87 silos)		Corn silage (81 silos)	
	Avg	Range	Avg	Range
Dry matter, %	42	24-67	34	25-46
Density on a fresh basis, lbs/ft^3	37	13-61	43	23-60
Density on a DM basis, lbs/ft^3	14.8	6.6-27.1	14.5	7.8-23.6
Avg particle size, inches	0.46	0.3-1.2	0.43	0.3-0.7

Protect Silage from Air and Water

Until recently, most large bunker, trench, or drive-over pile silos were left unsealed. Why? Because producers viewed covering silos with plastic and tires to be awkward, cumbersome, and labor intensive. Many believed the silage saved was not worth the time and effort required. But if left unprotected, DM losses in the top 1 to 3 feet can exceed 60 to 70% (Bolsen *et al.*, 1993). This is particularly disturbing when one considers that in the typical horizontal silo, 15 to 25% of the silage might be within the top three feet. When the silo is opened, the spoilage is only apparent in the top 6 to 12 inches of silage, obscuring the fact that this area of spoiled silage represents substantially more silage as originally stored (Holthaus *et al.*, 1995).

The most common sealing method is to place a polyethylene sheet (6 mil) over the ensiled forage and anchor it down with discarded tires (approximately 20 to 25 tires per 100 ft^2 of surface area). Dairy producers who do not seal need to take a second look at the economics of this highly troublesome ‘technology’ before they reject it as unnecessary and uneconomical. The loss from a

40- x 100-foot silo filled with corn silage can exceed $2,000. Loss from a 100- x 250-foot silo can exceed $10,000.

Manage the Feedout Face

The silage feedout "face" should be maintained as a smooth surface that is perpendicular to the floor and sides in bunker, trench, and drive-over pile silos. This will minimize the surface area exposed to air. The rate of feedout through the silage mass must be sufficient to prevent the exposed silage from heating and spoiling. An average removal rate 6-12 inches from the face per day is a common recommendation. However, during periods of warm, humid weather, a removal rate of 18 inches or more might be required to prevent aerobic spoilage, particularly for high-moisture (HM) ensiled grains and whole-plant corn, sorghum, and winter cereal silages. Hoffman and Ocker (1997) fed aerobically stable and unstable HM shelled corn to mid-lactation cows for three, 14-day periods. Milk yield of the cows fed the aerobically deteriorated HM corn declined by approximately 7 lbs per cow per day during each period compared to cows fed fresh, aerobically stable HM corn.

Discard Spoiled Silage

Sealing a silage mass using a polyethylene sheet anchored with tires is not 100 percent effective. Aerobic spoilage occurs to some degree in virtually all 'sealed' silos; and the discarding of surface spoilage is not always a common practice on the farm. But results of a recent study at Kansas State University showed that feeding surface spoilage had a significant negative impact on the nutritive value of a whole-plant corn silage-based ration (Whitlock *et al.*, 2000).

The original top three feet of corn silage in a bunker silo was allowed to spoil, and it was fed to steers fitted with ruminal cannulas. The four experimental rations contained 90% silage and 10% supplement (on a DM basis), and the proportions of silage in the rations were: A) 100% normal, B) 75% normal:25% spoiled; C) 50% normal:50% spoiled, and D) 25% normal:75% spoiled.

The proportion of the original top 18-inch and bottom 18-inch spoilage layers in the composited surface-spoiled silage was 24 and 76%, respectively. The original top 18-inch layer was visually quite typical of an unsealed layer of silage that had undergone several months of exposure to air and rainfall. It had a foul odor, was black in color, and had a slimy, 'mud-like' texture. Its extensive deterioration during storage was reflected in very high pH, ash, and fiber values. The original bottom 18-inch layer had an aroma and appearance usually associated with wet, high-acid corn silages, i.e., a bright yellow to orange color, a low pH, and a very strong acetic acid smell.

The addition of surface-spoiled silage had large negative associative effects on DM intake and organic matter (OM), neutral detergent fiber (NDF), and acid detergent fiber (ADF) digestibility (Table 5). The first 25% increment of spoilage had the greatest negative impact. When the rumen contents were evacuated, the spoiled silage had also partially or totally destroyed the integrity of the forage mat in the rumen. The results clearly showed that surface spoilage reduced the nutritive value of corn silage-based rations more than was expected.

Table 5. Effect of the level of spoiled silage on DM intake and nutrient digestibilities

Item	Ratio of normal : spoiled silage in the ration			
	100% normal	75:25	50:50	25:75
Spoilage layer, %[1]	0	5.4	10.7	16.0
DM intake, lbs/day	17.5[a]	16.2[b]	15.3[b,c]	14.7[c]
	------------------------- Digestibility, %	-------------------------		
OM	75.6[a]	70.6[b]	69.0[b]	67.8[b]
CP	74.6[a]	70.5[b]	68.0[b]	62.8[c]
NDF	63.2[a]	56.0[b]	52.5[b]	52.3[b]
ADF	56.1[a]	46.2[b]	41.3[b]	40.5[b]

[1] The percent of the "slimy" layer silage in the ration (DM basis).
[a,b,c] Means within a row differ (P<.05).

Bolsen, K. K., R. N. Sonon, Jr., B. Dalke, R. Pope, J. G. Riley, and A. Laytimi. 1992. Evaluation of inoculant and NPN silage additives: a summary of 26 trials and 65 farm-scale silages. Kansas Agric. Exp. Sta. Rpt. of Prog. 651:101-102.

Bolsen, K. K., J. T. Dickerson, B. E. Brent, R. N. Sonon, Jr., B. S. Dalke, C. J. Lin, and J. E. Boyer, Jr. 1993. Rate and extent of top spoilage in horizontal silos. J. Dairy Sci. 76: 2940-2962.

Hoffman, P.C. and Ocker, S.M. 1997. Quantification of milk yield losses associated with feeding aerobically unstable high moisture corn. J. Dairy Sci. 80(Suppl.1): 234 (Abstr.).

Holthaus, D. L., M. A. Young, B. E. Brent, and K .K. Bolsen. 1995. Losses from top spoilage in horizontal silos. Kansas Agric. Exp. Sta. Rpt. of Prog. 727 : 59-62.

Kung Jr., L., and R. E. Muck. 1997. Animal response to silage additives. p. 200-212. *In* Silage: Field to Feedbunk. NRAES-99. NRAES. Ithaca, NY.

Muck, R. E. 1993. The role of silage additives in making high quality silage. p. 106-116. *In* Proc. Nat. Silage Prod. Conf. NRAES-67, Ithaca, NY.

Muck, R. E., and L. Kung, Jr. 1997. Effects of silage additives on ensiling. p. 187-199. *In* Silage: Field to Feedbunk. NRAES-99. NRAES. Ithaca, NY.

Muck, R. E. and B. J. Holmes. (1999) Factors affecting bunker silo densities. 1999. The XII International Silage Conference. Uppsala, Sweden. pp 278 – 279.

Ruppel, K. A., R. E. Pitt, L. E. Chase, and D. M. Galton. 1995. Bunker silo management and its relationship to forage preservation on dairy farms. J. Dairy Sci. 78:141-153.

Whitlock, L.A., T. Wistuba, M.K. Siefers, R.V. Pope, B.E. Brent, and K.K. Bolsen. 2000. Effect of level of surface-spoiled silage on the nutritive value of corn silage-based rations. Kansas Agric. Exp. Sta. Rpt. of Prog. 850: 22-24.

HIGH COW REPORT
April, 2003

MILK

Arizona Owner	Barn#	Age	Milk	New Mexico Owner	Barn #	Age	Milk
* Red River Dairy	841	5-1	43,071	* Do-Rene Dairy	3485	5-06	37,160
* Red River Dairy	282	6-4	40,427	S.A.S. Dairy	13	5-02	36,750
* Stotz Dairy West	19879	3-2	39,100	* Goff Dairy	11373	4-03	35,470
* Red River Dairy	986	5-1	37,660	* Do-Rene Dairy	1628	8-06	35,290
* Stotz Dairy West	19809	3-2	37,290	* Goff Dairy	6019	4-03	34,890
* Red River Dairy	2536	3-1	36,833	S.A.S. Dairy	1062	6-06	34,728
* Stotz Dairy West	14028	4-2	36,750	* Do-Rene Dairy	1977	6-06	34,470
* Red River Dairy	1221	5-2	36,030	* Goff Dairy	6463	4-03	34,350
* Red River Dairy	2046	3-2	35,943	* Do-Rene Dairy	1387	5-06	34,320
* Red River Dairy	1274	5-0	35,587	* Goff Dairy	13165	4-03	34,200

FAT

* Red River Dairy	282	6-4	1785	S.A.S. Dairy	1563	9-10	1371
* Red River Dairy	2488	3-1	1701	Ken Miller Dairy	606	5-08	1357
* Red River Dairy	1221	5-2	1651	Pareo Dairy	423	7-10	1296
* Red River Dairy	3150	3-1	1555	Pareo Dairy	8752	6-03	1286
* Red River Dairy	986	5-1	1513	Pareo Dairy	1999	4-00	1277
* Red River Dairy	841	5-1	1466	* Goff Dairy	11373	4-03	1242
* Stotz Dairy West	13659	4-5	1462	S.A.S. Dairy	4456	4-00	1228
* Red River Dairy	1758	3-1	1460	* Goff Dairy	11149	5-06	1228
* Red River Dairy	2437	5-3	1455	Pareo Dairy	8347	6-00	1214
* Red River Dairy	3400	3-1	1450	* Goff Dairy	6490	4-03	1212

PROTEIN

* Red River Dairy	841	5-1	1267	S.A.S. Dairy	13	5-02	1188
* Red River Dairy	282	6-4	1105	* Milagro Dairy	5200	3-04	1116
* Red River Dairy	1221	5-2	1092	* Goff Dairy	11373	4-03	1092
* Red River Dairy	3135	3-1	1080	* Goff Dairy	6019	4-03	1082
* Rio Blanco Dairy	5378	2-10	1045	Caballo Dairy	3129	4-01	1078
* Red River Dairy	2341	5-1	1043	* Goff Dairy	6490	4-03	1072
* Dairyland Milk Co.	1328	2-11	1042	S.A.S. Dairy	4456	4-00	1066
* Red River Dairy	2848	3-1	1038	Ken Miller Dairy	606	5-08	1052
* Stotz Dairy West	14028	4-2	1035	Pareo Dairy	1568	5-05	1048
* Stotz Dairy West	19879	3-2	1023	S.A.S. Dairy	1062	6-06	1052
				* Goff Dairy	11149	5-06	1049

* 3X milking

ARIZONA – TOP 50% FOR F.C.M. [b]
APRIL, 2003

OWNERS NAME	Number of Cows	MILK	FAT	3.5 FCM	D.I.M.
* Stotz Dairy West	2159	28,010	1036	28,913	218
* Red River Dairy	4177	27,957	998	28,274	186
* Triple G Dairy Inc.	4052	25,713	952	26,557	202
University of Arizona Holsteins	181	25,514	896	25,564	225
* Mike Pylman	2462	25,376	894	25,470	217
* Arizona Dairy Company North	2639	24,996	883	25,128	209
* Stotz Dairy East	1246	24,116	867	24,400	239
* Arizona Dairy Company South	3348	24,710	851	24,487	198
* Danzeisen Dairy, LLC	1251	24,200	864	24,476	201
* Wigwam Dairy	1374	23,729	863	24,256	217
* Hillcrest Dairy	2336	24,281	841	24,138	202
* Zimmerman Dairy	1141	23,999	859	24,135	224
* Del Rio Holsteins	1241	23,685	853	24,075	181
University of Arizona Brown Swiss	104	22,555	870	23,862	180
D. C. Dairy, LLC.	1002	23,289	847	23,006	214
Paul Rovey Dairy	435	23,173	831	23,496	201
* Rio Blanco Dairy	1769	23,145	816	23,241	202
* Treger Holsteins, Inc.	498	22,450	803	22,733	217
* Saddle Mountain Dairy	2156	23,280	749	22,211	208
* Butler Dairy	619	22,057	778	22,155	210
* Del Rio Brown Swiss	184	21,458	794	22,155	210
* RG Dairy, LLC	1279	21,845	762	21,803	209
* Dairyland Milk Company	2831	21,874	761	21,799	199
* Dutch View Dairy	1377	21,317	742	21,250	224
Parker Dairy	4253	20,614	756	21,174	220
* Goldman Dairy	2094	20,922	745	21,128	206
* Caballero Farms, LLLP Holsteins	1741	21,044	737	21,052	191

NEW MEXICO TOP 50% ACTUAL MILK – OFFICIAL & UNOFFICIAL HERDS

OWNERS NAME	Number of Cows	MILK	FAT	3.5 FCM	D.I.M.
* Hafliger Dairy	1684	27,957	998	28,272	216
* Pareo Dairy #1	1364	26,813	954	27,064	216
* Hide-Away Dairy	2209	25,853	880	25,449	194
McCatharn North Dairy	1047	24,593	---	---	189
Providence Dairy	2684	24,592	823	23,979	200
Ken Miller Dairy	370	24,505	838	24,185	219
* Do-Rene Dairy	2252	24,442	844	24,255	200
* Tallmon Dairy	494	24,423	840	24,182	209
* Goff Dairy	4436	23,723	839	23,863	219
Pareo Dairy #2	2828	23,611	884	24,544	195
* S.A.S. Dairy	2039	23,351	836	23,654	181
Breedyk Dairy	2787	23,032	737	21,910	197
Vaz Dairy	1719	22,940	784	22,633	203

* 3X a day milking

[b] average milk and fat figure may be different from monthly herd summary; figures used are last day/month

ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO HERD IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY
APRIL, 2003

		ARIZONA	NEW MEXICO
1.	Number of herds	55	24
2.	Total cows in herd	77,800	42,607
3.	Average herd size	1415	1775
4.	Percent days in milk	92	88
5.	Average days in milk	200	200
6.	Average milk – all cows per day	65	63.8
7.	Average percent fat – all cows	3.6	3.6
8.	Total cows in milk	71,576	13,871
9.	Average daily milk for milking cows	71	73
10.	Average days in milk – 1st breeding	80	72
11.	Average days open	156	147
12.	Average calving interval	13.9	13.9
13.	Percent somatic cell – linear 0-4	86	81
14.	Percent somatic cell – linear 5-6	7	12
15.	Percent somatic cell – linear 7 & above	7	5
16.	Average previous days dry	63	63
17.	Percent cows leaving herd	33	30
		STATE AVERAGE	
	MILK	22,437	22,932
	Percent butterfat	3.6	3.6
	Percent Protein	3.0	3.0
	Pounds fat	807	820
	Pounds protein	673	683

ARIZONA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVETE USE, $300

PRESRT STD
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
USDA
PERMIT NO G-268

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ARIZONA®
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
Department of Animal Sciences
P O Box 210038
Tucson, AZ 85721-0038

Phone: 520-621-3375
Fax: 520-621-9435
Email: arettig@ag.arizona.edu

Upcoming Events:

Arizona Dairy Production Conference
October 16, 2003
Sheraton Phoenix Airport Hotel
Phoenix, Arizona