Animal and Dairy Science Department
Rhodes Center for Animal & Dairy Science

Telephone: (706) 542-2581
Fax: (706) 542-9316

GEORGIA DAIRYFAX

http://www.ads.uga.edu/extension/newsletters.html JULY, AUGUST & SEPTEMBER 2008

Dear Dairy Producers:

The enclosed information was prepared by the University of Georgia Animal and Dairy Science faculty in Dairy Extension, Research & Teaching. We trust this information will be helpful to dairy farmers and dairy related businesses for continued improvement of the Georgia Dairy Industry.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

Sincerely,

Wm. Graves

William M. Graves
Professor & Extension Dairy Scientist
wgraves@uga.edu

County Extension Director or County Agent

DAIRYFAX NEWSLETTER

Bertrand Named Department Head of UGA Animal & Dairy Science

Starting August 1, Dr. Keith Bertrand assumed the duties as new head of the Animal and Dairy Science Department of the University of Georgia College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. Dr. Bertrand was born in Baton Rouge and grew up in Milton, Florida. He graduated with honors in Animal Sciences from the University of Florida, earned his Master's and Ph.D. in animal breeding and genetics from Iowa State. He joined the ADS faculty in 1983. He is considered an expert around the world in the area of livestock genetic evaluation, having been invited to give more than 70 presentations at international or national scientific or industry meetings in nine countries. As a professor, he has advised both undergraduate and graduate students and has directed or co-directed 13 students who have received their doctorate and seven students that have received a master's degree. Dr. Bertrand has authored or co-authored 93 refereed journal articles and more than 250 other articles and reports. Students, faculty and staff look forward to the leadership of Dr. Bertrand.

Melony Wilson—Animal Waste Management Specialist

Receiving a joint appointment with Biological & Agricultural Engineering and Animal & Dairy Science, Melony Wilson began working April 1, 2008. She comes to UGA from the University of Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service where she served as Nutrient Management Training Coordinator. Raised on a family farm in Alma, Arkansas, she learned that farming involves hard work, resourcefulness, drive, and risk taking in order to be successful. In college, she became interested in environmental issues pertaining to the livestock industry and ways to gather information to help determine the contribution of agriculture to water quality issues. Based on the experience she has obtained, Ms. Wilson does not consider animal waste a "waste" product but rather an affordable nutrient resource and soil amendment that producers can use to produce crops. Her previous experience allows her to speak about environmental issues to regulators, community leaders, educators, and nutrient planners, yet still relate to producers and see things from their point of view. We welcome Melony to the University of Georgia and our department. Her contact information is below.

Melony Wilson
E.L. Rhodes Center
425 River Road
Athens, GA 30602
706 542-9108
mlwilson@uga.edu

Dairying in a Green Society

John K. Bernard
Dairy Research and Extension

Almost anywhere you look today everyone is telling you what they have done to be more environmentally friendly or "green". Originally the choices were paper or plastic, but today we can choose paper free statements for our bills, direct deposit for payments, more energy efficient light bulbs and appliances, alternative energy vehicles, and many other new technologies designed to reduce energy use that the production of greenhouse gases and improve air and water quality. This movement has gained momentum after oil prices increased to more than $150 per barrel. But how does agriculture fit into the green movement?

The production of biofuels from crops has been one of the primary stories in the headlines related to agriculture, but we also see stories about the negative impact of growing additional corn on the environmental because of fertilizer needed to grow more corn and soybeans to meet the biofuel demands. Animal agriculture has been viewed by many as less environmentally friendly for some time because most livestock operations today have more animals concentrated in one location which also concentrates the waste product. Some have suggested that the cattle industry generate more greenhouse gas (methane) than any other industry in the world. There are many who have suggested that agriculture should return to the smaller sized family run operations that were common fifty years ago.

This summer two papers were published that address this issue as it relates to the dairy industry. The first paper focused on the changes that have occurred in the dairy industry during the last century and the impact it has had on the environment. The second paper was a report from the United Nations on the impact of intensive agriculture on the world environment.

The dairy industry has changed a lot during the last century. The change the cow population, milk yield per cow, and total milk production in the United States and Georgia from 1945 to 2006 are listed in the Table 1. It is no surprise to anyone that there are fewer dairy cows in the US today than in 1945. As we look at these data, it becomes clear that milk yield per cow has increased tremendously. The increased milk yield per cow is a result of improved genetics, nutrition, housing, preventive health care, cow comfort, and management. Even with a much smaller dairy herd, the dairy industry produces more milk today than ever before to meet the market needs. The results of this from an environmental standpoint based on the changes outlined above are:

- Because of the high milk yield per cow, more of the nutrients consumed for milk production rather than maintenance reducing the amount of waste (manure solids and urine) and greenhouse gases (methane and carbon dioxide) produced per unit of milk produced.

- Dairy producers converted thousands of tons of byproducts from the food and beverage industry into high quality food products rather than these products going to waste in a landfill or applied to fields.

- As ethanol production increases to reduce out dependance on foreign oil, the livestock industry is expected to use all of the byproducts.

- Additives such as buffers, yeast culture, and monensin improve ruminal fermentation which reduces greenhouse gases that are naturally produced by the microorganisms in the rumen and improves in the efficiency of nutrient utilization.

Table 1. Change in dairy cow numbers, milk yield and total milk production.

	United States			Georgia		
Year	Cows, x1,000	Yield, lb/ cow/yr	Total Milk Production, million lbs.	Cows x1,000	Yield, lb/ cow/yr	Total Milk Production, million lbs.
1945	25,033	4,787	119,828	360	3,150	1,134
2006	9,112	19,951	181,798	77	18,234	1,404
2006 as a % of 1945	36.4%	418%	152%	21.4%	579%	124%

Along with the green movement, consumers are taking a greater interest in what is in the foods they purchase and consume. If you look at any of the advertisements, you will see produces advertised as being "hormone free", "antibiotic free", "humanely raised", or other labels. A paper published a group of researchers clearly shows that all milk is similar regardless of the production practices used. Commodity milk contains the same amount of growth hormone and other naturally occurring hormones as milk from cows certified organic or those given rBST. This does not mean that there are not marketing opportunities for these niche products, but hopefully this will calm some of the consumer fears that have been caused by some ambitious marketers inaccurate claims that only hurts the dairy industry as a whole.

One of the greatest challenges we have in agriculture is to educate the average consumer who doesn't know how their food is produced and what has been done to insure that we have not only adequate supplies, but that it is healthy. Fortunately the dairy industry has a number of people who are working to tell the consumer about the positive attributes of dairy products, but all of us must take each opportunity to teach consumers about the good things agriculture and the dairy industry are doing every change we get.

- September 21– Gwinnett County Commercial Heifer Show, Lawrenceville, GA
- October 5– Georgia National Commercial Heifer Show, Perry, GA
- October 10-12– Georgia National Open Dairy Shows, Perry, GA
- 2008 SE Dairy Herd Management Conference will be held on November 12 and 13 (Wednesday and Thursday) at the Georgia Farm Bureau Building in Macon, Georgia. Be sure to mark your calendar to attend and hear the latest information about the dairy industry. Further information can be obtained from Lane Ely - 706-542-9107 or laneely@uga.edu.

Beware of Aflatoxins

Lane Ely
Extension Dairy Science

This year has been an interesting growing season as rain fall has been sporadic. This has resulted in areas of drought and stress in plant growth. With the increase in price of corn, new harvest corn from the south is coming on the market. Recently several reports have shown levels of aflatoxin above accepted levels. For feeding the dairy cow, the level of aflatoxin should be below 20 ppb. Because of the conversion in the dairy cow to milk, this level should be below .5 ppb in the milk. If the milk aflatoxin is above .5 ppb then the milk is pulled from the market.

Many elevators are not checking the aflatoxin levels. So if you are purchasing new crop corn, you should have a guarantee of the aflatoxin level or do an aflatoxin test yourself to insure that it is at safe levels.

Improving your Reproduction Espanol:

Are you asking the right reproducción (reproduction) questions Part 3…

By

W.M. Graves

More and more of our producers are speaking more Spanish to better manage their herds and their labor force. Recently, visiting students at UGA from South America helped translate some of the following information to help producers better use Spanish to evaluate reproductive management and communicate with employees. Many times checklists are very handy to review management. After all, our goal for maximum lifetime leche (milk) is to get every vaca (cow) pregnada (pregnant). The first article (July, Aug. Sept. 2007) dealt with semen tank management. The next (April, May, June 2008) dealt with heat detection, synchronization and timed AI. The final article deals with AI techniques.

Insemination Techniques Or Tècnicas de Inseminación…

Fertility (or Fertilidad) is a challenge in dairy management. Unlike heat detection and post partum breeding policies, drastic increases and improvements are much more difficult. When evaluating fertility, consider the following:

- Colocación del semen or semen placement.
- Manejo del semen or semen handling.
- Tiempo de crianza or time of breeding.
- Fertilidad del semen or semen fertility.

Using the following insemination techniques checklist (Lista de técnicas de inseminación) review proper AI procedures with your employees.

1. Use un guante nuevo para cada inseminación (Use a new glove for every insemination).

2. Lubrica el guante con aceite mineral (Lubricate the glove with mineral oil or a commercial A.I. lubricant).

3. Hable y toque el animal para avisarle que usted está presente (Speak to and touch the animal to make her aware of your presence).

4. Masajee el ano con aceite mineral o lubricante (Massage the anus with mineral oil or lubricant).

5. Cuidadosamente entre al recto formando un cono con sus dedos (Gently enter the rectum by forming a cone with your fingers).

6. Cuidadosamente elimine completamente el estiércol del recto (Gently and thoroughly clean the rectum of manure).

7. Revise el útero en busca de cualquier condición anormal (Check the uterus for any abnor mal condition).

8. Con una toalla de papel limpie el excuemento de la vulva y de su antebrazo (Clean manure from the vulva and from the underside of your arm with a paper towel).

9. Abra la vulva empujando hacia abajo con su brazo sobre el recto (Spread the vulva by pus hing down with your arm above the rectum).

10. Con cuidado pase la pipeta a travès de la vagina hasta la boca del canal cervical (Gently and smoothly pass the gun through the vagina to the opening to the cervical canal -the cervical os).

11. Coloque la punta de la pipeta dentro del canal cervical (Place the tip of the gun into the os).

12. Sostenga el cèrvix delante de la punta de la pipeta y manipule la cervix para permitir que la pipeta pase (Hold the cervix ahead of the gun's tip and manipulate the cervix to allow the gun to pass).

13. Evite pasar la pipeta a travès del cervix si sospecha que puede haber gestación. Ojo: un tapón de moco pegajoso indica gestación (Avoid passing the gun through the cervix if pregnancy is suspected. Note: Pregnancy is indicated by a sticky mucus plug).

14. Coloque su dedo índice al final de la boca del canal cèrvical (Place your index finger at the far end of the cervical canal opening).

15. Con cuidado mueva la punta de la pipeta hacia adelante hasta que la sienta con su dedo (Gently move the gun tip forward until you feel it with your finger).

16. Introduzca la punta de la pipeta ¼ de pulgada más alla despuès del final del cervix. El obje tivo es del tamaño de un "centano" (Pass the gun tip ¼ inch past the end of the cervix. Your target is only the size of a dime).

17. Asegúrese de que la punta de la pipeta no se encuentre atrapada en un área delgada entre los anillos cervicales (Be certain the gun tip is not caught in between cervical rings).

18. Concéntrese en depositar el semen correctamente (Concentrate on accurate semen place ment during deposition).

19. Empuje el èmbolo dentro de la pipeta lentamente por 5 seg (Slowly for 5 seconds, push the plunger into the straw gun).

20. Si el animal se mueve, pare la deposición, una vez se detenga revise la posición y continue depositando (If the animal moves, stop the deposit. Wait until movement stops, check posi tioning, then continue to deposit).

21. Con cuidado, saque la pipeta y revise por descargas anormal y por un depósito de semen completo (Gently remove the gun and check for an abnormal discharge and a complete se men deposit).

22. Anote cuando, y a que engender cou qe toro la vaca fue críada (Record when, and to what sire, the animal was bred).

AI trouble shooting (or resolvendo los problemas)…

1. Sangre en su guante? Sea cuidadoso (Blood on your glove? Be gentle).

2. Colocación apropriada? Concèntrece (Proper placement? Concentrate).

3. No más de 3 minutos en la mayoría de las vacas? Esto viene con la experiencia. (No more than 1 to 3 minutes on most cows? This comes with experience.)

4. ¿Hay alguna vaca de servicio repetitivo que este presentando alguna descarga anormal? La limpieza es importante. Utilize una capa protectora (Are some repeat service cows showing abnormal discharge? Sanitation is important. Use sheath protectors.)

Se da por vencido con las vacas difíciles? Paciencia, funcionará (Do you give up on the rough ones? Patience; it will work).
Hopefully, this has helped you get better oriented with Spanish and improving your reproductive management, as well as give you some information to help better communicate with your employees.

Ojala y todas tus vacas queden preñadas (May all your cows be pregnant)! Be sure to say "muchas gracias" to those who helped. If you get stuck, GOOGLE a Spanish-English Dictionary. There are several readily available online that can help.

Time to Think about Winter Annual Forages

John K. Bernard
Dairy Research and Extension

Many producers plant winter annuals that can be used either for grazing, to produce forage, or a combination of these. Over the past 10 years we have conducted several trials examining the use of annual ryegrass in rations for lactating dairy cows. Other winter annuals will also produce high quality forage, but ryegrass harvested at the vegetative stage of maturity is one of the more digestible winter annual forages available when managed properly. There are several varieties of annual ryegrass to choose from and most are capable of producing high quality forage. Information on the varieties enrolled in the University of Georgia variety test program are posted at the following web site under the small grains category: http://www.caes.uga.edu/commodities/swvt/

The variety test results provide both the total annual yield and the yield for each clipping. The clipping information that can be used to plot a growth curve. Some varieties produce greater yields earlier in the fall whereas others product higher when forage availability is more limiting. Other varieties product a greater proportion of their total yield during the latter portion of their growth cycle. If planted for stored forage and you plan to harvested early, this information also provides an estimate of the yield reduction that many occur. The variable cost of producing winter annuals is approximately $225 to $250 per acre using commercial fertilizer to meet the plants nutrient needs. A link to budgets for winter annuals can be found at the UGA forages web page (http://www.caes.uga.edu/commodities/fieldcrops/forages/).

Many dairy producers' grazing winter annuals each year as a means of providing high quality forage through a relatively inexpensive means as long as the fields are close to the dairy. When these forages are used for supplemental grazing, cows will eat 5 to 6 lb. of DM in one to two 2 hours when forage is abundant. If forage is limiting, DM intake was be less if grazing time unless additional is provided for the cows to consume the desired amounts. Today more dairy producers are interested in intensively managed grazing systems in which the cow is maintained on grass all of the time except during milking. Several years ago, at the Tifton Dairy Research Center, we ran a spring grazing trial with annual ryegrass to examine the benefits of feeding supplemental concentrate. Without any supplemental concentrate the cows averaged 42 lb/d milk yield, but yield increased significantly when concentrate was fed. In that trial, milk yield and return over the cost of the supplemental concentrate was optimized when 1 lb of grain was fed for each 4 lb of milk produced which was approximately 15 lb of concentrate in that situation. There is an economic limit on the amount of supplemental concentrate that should be fed, especially if forage supplies are abundant, but there are times when additional concentrate may be fed to maintain cow numbers on a fixed amount of pasture when it is limited in supply. To maximize forage availability, producers should look at a combination of forages will provide more total forage through the entire grazing period than a monoculture system based on ryegrass or other winter annual. Your local extension agent will have suggestions on what combinations work well in your area.

Many producers use winter annuals to produce forage which is harvested, stored and fed throughout the year. At the Tifton Dairy Research Center, we normally harvest our forages in the vegetative stage of maturity anywhere from the middle of March to early April. After wilting to approximately 35 to 50% DM, the forage is chopped and stored in a silage bag. A bacterial inoculate is applied at the chopper to provide uniform coverage. The NDF digestibility at 30 hours is normally greater than 75% for this forage.

We recently completed a trial examining the effect of wilting before harvest on intake and production. We allowed every other row of ryegrass forage to wilt to either 39 or 53% DM before chopping. Both treatments were stored for 90 days before feeding. The diet contained (DM basis) 22% ryegrass silage, 30% corn silage, and the remaining 49% was concentrate. Both silages contained similar nutrient concentrations and did not have abnormal fermentation. Cow fed the diet with the silage that had been wilted to 53% produced 2.5 lb/d more milk. No differences were observed in DM intake or milk composition. Research has demonstrated that forages, especially grasses, that were not wilted undergo poor fermentation which depresses intake. These results suggest that we need to look at wilting these winter annual forages to higher DM content than previously recommended when stored in silage bags. Although this worked well with the bag system, a slightly wetter forage would allow better packing in a bunker or trench silo.

In other trials, we have observed that milk yield is better when a blend of corn silage and annual ryegrass silage are fed compared to feeding either as the sole forage. It did not appear that there was an ideal blend of these forages which allows a lot of flexibility when planning a feeding program. In other work we replaced all of the alfalfa hay in the ration with ryegrass silage without any change in milk yield or composition when the ration was balanced. We did observe that feeding a greater proportion of sorghum silage to ryegrass silage supported higher DM intake and milk yield that compared with feeding equal amounts of these silages.

Winter annuals such as ryegrass provide an opportunity to produce high quality forage that can be utilized as grazing or stored forage that dairymen should consider using as part of their forage program. The quality of well managed winter annual forage is extremely good and can be used in rations to support high levels of milk production. When used as a stored forage, it is important to wilt the forage to greater than 35% or higher before harvest. This reduces undesirable fermentation when the forage is very wet. Because of their high nutritive value, feeding winter annual forage with either corn silage or sorghum silage allows rations to be formulated using large quantities of forage with is especially attractive with ingredient prices today.

Where Did the Corn Go? Rations at the UGA Teaching Dairy

Lane Ely
Extension Dairy Science

In the last issue of the Dairy Fax, I discussed the ration problems the UGA Teaching Dairy was experiencing with short supply of wheat silage and the high cost of whole cottonseed. We fed green chop for three weeks as our wheat crop ensiled. We fed our new wheat silage with 3 pounds of alfalfa hay and 3 pounds of whole cottonseed. By June 1st we had fed our alfalfa hay and whole cottonseed. As whole cottonseed reached $425 per ton, we decided not buy more. At this time we also needed corn grain and put out a bid request. The corn bid came back at $9.65 per bushel. After that little shock, I ran our ration program. The resulting ration did not have any corn in it as corn was priced out of the ration. I had never fed a milking cow ration without some corn grain in it. Examining the herd showed we had no cows in early lactation (<120 days in milk), average days in milk was 245 and several cows were to be dried off in the next 60 days. We decided to not feed any corn grain.

The concentrate was	pounds per ton
Corn Gluten Feed	549.3
SBM48	109.8
Soy Hulls	215.1
Rumen Undegradable Protein	277.7
Citrus Pulp	605.0
Dicalcium Phosphate	14.0
Salt	7.5
Vitamin ADE	0.7
Zin Pro	0.5
Trace Minerals	0.7
Wheat	219.7
	2000.00

For soluble carbohydrates we used wheat. Too much wheat will cause acidosis as the carbohydrates are rapidly fermented. Recommended limits are 4 pounds per cow per day.

Our ration was 36 pounds of the concentrate mix per day with 75 pounds per day of wheat silage. The cows were averaging 65 pounds of milk per day when we started the ration and 45 days later are still averaging 65 pounds.

To include corn grain at the bid price would have raised our feed cost per cow per day by $.46. Our latest bid for corn was $6.35 per bushel and yes, it will be back in our ration. Especially as we will start calving cows.

New DHIA Reports

Warren D. Gilson

Dairy Herd Improvement Programs (DHI) had their beginning in 1905 in Michigan. Since then, numerous changes have occurred in the program to the extent that dairymen from that era probably would have a hard time recognizing the program. They probably couldn't even have dreamed of the changes that have occurred over the years.

There are some significant changes occurring again. A number of new reports have been developed which will assist dairy producers in managing their herds on a daily basis. Many of these reports would not have even been considered a just few years ago. But as the industry has changed, new reports have become necessary and many of the old reports revised to provide the information required to efficiently manage the modern dairy herd.

A list of these reports is included, along with an indication of the target herds which would be most interested in using these reports. Contact your supervisor if you are interested in obtaining any of these reports. You should also speak with your supervisor concerning other reports you would like to have available. Some of them may already be available but you are unaware of them and in other cases they may need to be developed. Regardless, the goal of the DHI program is to provide the necessary tools for dairy producers to efficiently and effectively manage their herd.

NEW REPORT

REPORT NAME	TARGET HERDS
217 - Herd Progress Report	Herds that get DHI-207 (Herd Average History); good report for banking consultants
219 - Basic Herd Summary	Herds wanting a simplified herd summary or wanting to supplement the DHI-202
231 - Persistency Analysis	Herds > 300 that test consistently (10+ tests per year).
232 - Survival Analysis	Herds with erratic turnover rates; herds with involuntary culling problems.
312 - Lactation Report	Herds wanting Remarks feature or Standardized ME or Production Index on their lactation report.
355 - Heat Interval	Small herds <250 cows; herds seeking to resolve reproductive problems
360 - Reproduction Report	Herds wanting a report for use as a reproduction management tool; herds seeking to resolve reproductive problems.
365 - Condensed DHI Report	All herds, especially those who want herd summary and individual cow data on the same report; herds receiving MUN data
370 - Flex Report	Herds getting lab data
419 - Pocket Report / Action List	All herds that prefer a paper list; herds not enrolled on DHI-214 as heifers do not print on these lists
576 - ID List with RFID	Herds <250 cows using RFID and not using PCDART

REVISED REPORTS

REPORT NAME	TARGET HERDS
205 Special List - Breeding Package *Changed to checkbook size, can be inserted in plastic binder*	Herds that prefer a paper list; herds on DHI-214 as heifers print on these lists
501-505 Full Size Action Lists *Slight changes in layout and data*	Herds wanting to supplement pocket lists, herds that prefer a full size list with more data; herds that like room to make notes on the report
519 Pocket List - All Cows with Repro *Changed to checkbook size*	Herds wanting a pocket list with current performance; herds getting 205 that also want a list of all cows

Source: DRMS 8/2008

TOP 20 DHIA HERDS BY TEST DAY MILK PRODUCTION- MAY 2008

				Test Day Average						Yearly Average	
Herd	**County**	**Br.**	**Mo.**	**Cows**	**% Days in Milk**	**Milk**	**% Fat**	**TD Fat**		**Milk**	**Lbs. Fat**
D & T Dairy	Wilkes	X	5	111	84	88.2				24309	
Dave Clark	Morgan	H	5	905	88	86.4	3.4	2.56		24516	878
Scott Glover	White	H	4	86	87	82.3	3.7	2.76		24074	901
Gene Bowen	Pierce	H	4	199	86	80.1				20831	
J. Everett Williams	Morgan	H	5	748	91	80	3.6	2.73		26071	967
Irvin R Yoder	Macon	H	5	126	90	78.8	3.6	2.56		23568	873
Williams Dairy	Taliaferro	H	5	118	89	78.5	3	2.2		22843	811
Vista Farms	Jefferson	H	5	82	87	77.5	3.2	2.47		23537	816
Univ. of GA Dairy Farm	Clarke	H	5	117	86	74.9	3.4	2.32		21489	799
Eatonton Dairy Farms LLLP	Putnam	H	5	772	89	73.8	3.2	2.14		22196	
R&D Dairy	Laurens	H	5	116	86	72.7	3.1	2.05		21833	756
Kent Walker	Greene	H	5	113	89	72.1	3.1	2.16		22384	751
Marvin Yoder	Macon	H	5	141	86	72.1	3.6	2.4		21767	794
Jeff Yoder	Macon	H	5	106	83	71.8	3.1	2.01		20276	669
Horst Crest Farms	Burke	H	4	152	85	71.7	3.6	2.39		20771	733
Agr-Fresh Dairy	Laurens	H	5	223	86	71.4	3.3	2.08		22339	772
Rufus Yoder Jr.	Macon	H	4	142	89	71.4	3.5	2.28		20986	740
Brooksco Dairy	Brooks	H	5	2509	87	70				21072	
Danny Bell	Morgan	H	5	257	88	69.7	3.9	2.47		21740	
Cecil Dueck	Jefferson	H	5	68	91	69.4	3.5	2.35		21332	780

1Minimum herd size of 10 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. (Mo.) column indicates month of test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is complied from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).

TOP 20 DHIA HERDS BY TEST DAY FAT PRODUCTION- MAY 2008

				Test Day Average					Yearly Average	
Herd	**County**	**Br.**	**Mo.**	**Cows**	**% Days in Milk**	**Milk**	**% Fat**	**TD Fat**	**Milk**	**Lbs. Fat**
Scott Glover	White	H	4	86	89	82.3	3.7	2.76	24074	901
J. Everett Williams	Morgan	H	5	748	88	80	3.6	2.73	26071	967
Dave Clark	Morgan	H	5	905	87	86.4	3.4	2.56	24516	878
Irvin R. Yoder	Macon	H	5	126	89	78.8	3.6	2.56	23568	873
Martin Dairy L.L.P.	Hart	H	4	311	93	68.7	3.8	2.54	22268	821
Vista Farm	Jefferson	H	5	82	86	77.5	3.2	2.47	23537	816
Danny Bell	Morgan	H	5	257	89	69.7	3.9	2.47	21740	
Marvin Yoder	Macon	H	5	141	86	72.1	3.6	2.4	21767	794
Horst Crest Farms	Burke	H	4	152	87	71.7	3.6	2.39	20771	733
Twin Oaks Farm	Jefferson	H	5	92	88	63.8	3.8	2.35	21765	778
Cecil Dueck	Jefferson	H	5	68	89	69.4	3.5	2.35	21332	780
Fuller-Dairy,Inc.	Putnam	H	5	225	87	63.3	3.7	2.33	21332	
Univ of GA Dairy Farm	Clarke	H	5	117	90	74.9	3.4	2.32	21489	799
Rodgers' Hillcrest Farms Inc.	McDuffie	H	5	376	91	67.2	3.5	2.28	21599	772
Rufus Yoder Jr.	Macon	H	4	142	91	71.4	3.5	2.28	20986	740
Bill Dodson	Putnam	H	5	215	90	66.6	3.5	2.24	20841	776
Coastal Plain Exp Station	Tift	H	5	228	85	66.2	3.6	2.23	24939	933
Troy Yoder	Macon	H	5	138	89	64.8	3.6	2.23	21693	801
Williams Dairy	Taliaferro	H	5	118	90	78.5	3	2.2	22843	811
David L. Moss	Morgan	H	5	105	91	67.8	3.7	2.2	20567	811

1Minimum herd size of 10 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. (Mo.) column indicates month of test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records management Systems Reports (Raliegh, NC).

TOP 20 DHIA HERDS BY TEST DAY MILK PRODUCTION JUNE 2008

				Test Day Average						Yearly Average	
Herd	**County**	**Br.**	**Mo.**	**Cows**	**% Days in Milk**	**Milk**	**% Fat**	**TD Fat**		**Milk**	**Lbs Fat**
Dave Clark	Morgan	H	6	917	88	82.1	3.3	2.38		24496	875
Irvin R Yoder	Macon	H	6	130	86	79.3	3.6	2.67		23365	865
J. Everett Williams	Morgan	H	6	748	89	76.6	3.8	2.64		26036	966
Vista Farms	Jefferson	H	6	82	90	73.9	3.2	2.33		23521	813
D&T Dairy	Wilkes	X	6	109	84	72.1				24317	
Martin Dairy L.L.P.	Hart	H	6	291	90	70.9	3.4	2.19		22101	811
Scott Glover	White	H	6	88	87	70.1	3.7	2.36		23946	907
Whitty & Son LLC.	Pierce	H	6	1106	89	70.1				20669	
Danny Bell	Morgan	H	6	224	88	70	4	2.51		21782	
Marvin Yoder	Macon	H	6	138	86	69.4	3.7	2.18		21732	793
Cecil Dueck	Jefferson	H	5	68	91	69.4	3.5	2.35		21332	780
R & D Dairy	Laurens	H	6	110	86	69.2	3.2	1.83		22384	755
Kent Walker	Greene	H	6	107	89	68.8	3.5	2.18		21819	751
Agr-Fresh Dairy	Laurens	H	6	208	86	68.7	3.7	2.13		22344	761
Ivan Peters	Jefferson	H	6	105	87	68.4	3.5	2.23		21985	742
Eatonton Dairy Farms LLLP	Putnam	H	6	772	87	68.3	3.3	2.04		20086	
Williams Dairy	Taliaferro	H	6	123	91	68	3.1	1.94		22117	804
Horst Crest Farms	Burke	H	6	144	85	67.9	3.3	1.97		22932	733
Phil Harvey	Jasper	H	6	472	86	66.2	3.4	2.09		20812	699
Univ of GA Dairy Farm	Clarke	H	6	114	88	65.5	3.6	2.18		19913	795

1Minimum herd size of 10 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. (Mo.) column indicates month of test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is complied from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).

TOP 20 DHIA TEST DAY FAT PRODUCTION- JUNE 2008

						Test Day Average			Yearly Average	
Herd	**County**	**Br.**	**Mo.**	**Cows**	**% Days in Milk**	**Milk**	**% Fat**	**TD Fat**	**Milk**	**Lbs Fat**
Irvin R. Yoder	Macon	H	6	130	86	79.3	3.6	2.67	23365	865
J. Everett Williams	Morgan	H	6	748	89	76.6	3.8	2.64	26036	966
Danny Bell	Morgan	H	6	244	88	70	4	2.51	21782	
Dave Clark	Morgan	H	6	917	88	82.1	3.3	2.38	24496	875
Scott Glover	White	H	6	88	87	70.1	3.7	2.36	23946	907
Cecil Dueck	Jefferson	H	5	68	91	69.4	3.5	2.35	21332	780
Twin Oaks Farm	Jefferson	H	5	92	91	63.8	3.8	2.35	21765	778
Vista Farm	Jefferson	H	6	82	90	73.9	3.2	2.33	23521	813
Ivan Peters	Jefferson	H	6	105	87	68.4	3.5	2.23	20086	742
Troy Yoder	Macon	H	5	138	90	64.8	3.6	2.23	21693	801
Martin Dairy L.L.P.	Hart	H	6	291	90	70.9	3.4	2.19	22101	811
Marvin Yoder	Macon	H	6	138	86	69.4	3.7	2.18	21732	793
Kent Walker	Greene	H	6	107	89	68.8	3.5	2.18	22344	751
Univ of GA Dairy Farm	Clarke	H	6	114	88	65.6	3.6	2.18	21474	795
Agri-Fresh Dairy	Laurens	H	6	208	86	68.7	3.7	2.13	21985	761
Phil Harvey	Jasper	H	5	472	86	66.2	3.4	2.09	19913	699
Eatonton Dairy Farms LLLP	Putnam	H	6	772	87	68.3	3.3	2.04	22117	
Rodgers' Hillcrest Farms Inc.	McDuffie	H	6	375	88	65.1	3.5	2.01	21725	780
Stovall Dairy Inc.	Madison	H	6	168	90	64.4	3.3	2.01	20755	750
Larry L. Holdeman	Jefferson	H	5	85	96	56.5	3.7	2.01	19999	760

1Minimum herd size of 10 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. (Mo.) column indicates month of test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records management Systems Reports (Raliegh, NC).

TOP 20 DHIA HERDS BY TEST DAY MILK PRODUCTION- JULY 2008

					Test Day Average					Yearly Average	
Herd	**County**	**Br.**	**Mo.**	**Cows**	**% Days in Milk**	**Milk**	**% Fat**	**TD Fat**		**Milk**	**Lbs. Fat**
D & T Dairy	Wilkes	X	7	112	83	80.9				24289	
Dave Clark	Morgan	H	7	915	88	78.6	3.5	2.47		24475	876
Irvin R. Yoder	Macon	H	7	130	86	76.5	3.7	2.6		23372	864
J. Everett Williams	Morgan	H	7	767	89	76.3	3.8	2.6		26026	970
Scott Glover	White	H	7	90	87	70.7	3.5	2.12		23819	907
Agri-Fresh Dairy	Laurens	H	7	206	85	69.4	3.4	1.9		21774	754
Eatonton Dairy Farms LLLP	Putnam	H	6	762	87	69.1	3.6	2.25		21990	
Brooksco Dairy	Brooks	H	7	2505	87	68.9				20661	
Danny Bell	Morgan	H	7	266	88	68.6	4	2.5		21785	
Marvin Yoder	Macon	H	7	137	85	68.6	3.9	2.15		21711	793
Univ of GA Dairy Farm	Clarke	H	7	109	88	67.9	3.7	2.07		21396	793
Krulic Dairy Farm, Inc.	Screven	H	7	101	90	67.7				22899	
Vista Farms	Jefferson	H	7	80	90	66.2	3.3	2.06		23621	814
Williams Dairy	Taliaferro	H	7	123	91	65	3.7	2.13		22739	795
Gene Bowen	Pierce	H	6	228	88	64.7				21698	
David L. Moss	Morgan	H	7	105	85	64.7	3.5	1.83		20468	803
Rodgers' Hillcrest Farms, Inc.	McDuffie	H	7	375	88	64.5	3.8	1.96		21779	786
Krulic Dairy Farm, Inc.	Screven	X	7	32	86	63.9				21270	
Whitty & Son LLC	Pierce	H	7	1106	89	63.9				20727	
Martin Dairy L.L.P.	Hart	H	7	295	90	63.8	3.8	1.95		22152	809

1Minimum herd size of 10 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. (Mo.) column indicates month of test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is complied from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).

TOP 20 DHIA TEST DAY FAT PRODUCTION- JULY 2008

						Test Day Average			Yearly Average	
Herd	**County**	**Br.**	**Mo.**	**Cows**	**% Days in Milk**	**Milk**	**% Fat**	**TD Fat**	**Milk**	**Lbs. Fat**
Irvin R. Yoder	Macon	H	7	130	86	76.5	3.7	2.6	23372	864
J. Everett Williams	Morgan	H	7	767	89	76.3	3.8	2.6	26026	970
Danny Bell	Morgan	H	7	266	88	68.6	4	2.5	21785	
Dave Clark	Morgan	H	7	915	88	78.6	3.5	2.47	24475	876
Ivan Peters	Jefferson	H	7	103	87	62.4	3.9	2.31	20225	747
Eatonton Dairy Farms LLLP	Putnam	H	6	762	87	69.1	3.6	2.25	21990	
Twin Oaks Farm	Jefferson	H	7	88	91	60.9	3.7	2.19	21180	781
Marvin Yoder	Macon	H	7	137	85	68.6	3.9	2.15	21711	793
Williams Dairy	Taliaferro	H	7	123	91	65	3.7	2.13	22739	795
Scott Glover	White	H	7	90	87	70.7	3.5	2.12	23819	907
Univ of GA Dairy Farm	Clarke	H	7	109	88	67.9	3.7	2.07	21396	793
Vista Farm	Jefferson	H	7	80	90	66.2	3.3	2.06	23621	814
W.T. Meriwether	Morgan	H	7	109	90	59.2	3.6	2.05	21014	743
Stovall Dairy Inc.	Madison	H	7	158	90	60.3	3.5	2.03	20798	745
Rodgers' Hillcrest Farms Inc.	McDuffie	H	7	375	88	64.5	3.8	1.96	21779	786
Martin Dairy L.L.P.	Hart	H	7	295	90	63.8	3.8	1.95	22152	809
Agri-Fresh Dairy	Laurens	H	7	206	85	69.4	3.4	1.9	21774	754
Franks Farm	Burke	H	7	36	93	53.1	3.8	1.89	21347	754
Cecil Dueck	Jefferson	H	6	68	91	61.2	3.4	1.88	20999	767
Ralph Kotal	Hart	H	7	59	91	53	3.7	1.86	21123	775

1Minimum herd size of 10 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. (Mo.) column indicates month of test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records management Systems Reports (Raliegh, NC).

Cooperative Extension Service
Department of Animal & Dairy Science
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Dairyfax Newsletter Enclosed