



GEORGIA DAIRYFAX

<http://www.ces.uga.edu/Agriculture/asdsvm/Dairyscience/dairypage.HTML>

May/June 2005

Dear Dairy Producers:

The enclosed information was prepared by the University of Georgia Animal and Dairy Science faculty & graduate students 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.

- **Where Did All This Stuff Come From?** by Dr. Lane Ely 2
- **Is Summer Acidosis Syndrome a Real Problem?** by Joe West 3
- **Dairy Business Analysis Project** by Dr. Lane Ely, Albert DeVries and Russ Giesy 5
- **The DHI Program Has Changed in the Last 100 Years** by Dr. Warren Gilson 8
- **What does Agrosecurity Mean to the Dairy Industry?** by John Bernard 9
- **Dawgs Top Dairy Judging** by Jillian Fain and Dr. William Graves 11
- **Top 20 DHIA Herds** by Test Day Milk and Fat Production for March/April 2005 12

Sincerely,



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

County Extension Director or County Agent

/ach

DAIRYFAX NEWSLETTER

Where did all this stuff come from?

**By, Dr. Lane O. Ely
Extension Dairy Scientist**

A few weeks ago, my wife and I went to Charleston to pick up our daughter after her first year at college. She had a final at 8:00 am Saturday morning and we were to meet her at noon to load up all her stuff. When we arrived at noon there were no parking spaces and we were all hungry so we went to lunch. On our return to the dorm, there still were no parking spaces. There are only 10 spaces for the four story dorm so like almost everyone, we parked in the nearest lot and proceeded back to the dorm. We then began the process of hauling down her stuff (Liz lived on the fourth floor) and stacking it in the yard. One of us stayed with the growing pile of goods while the other two climbed the stairs and hauled down another load. After my third trip and carrying down the TV, I decided it was my turn to sit on the bench with the stuff.

Sitting on the bench, I watched as the other groups slowly built their piles or filled their cars. Cars would slowly come in to the small parking lot hoping for a parking space. Many just stopped in the drive way to fill up. Several groups had TWO cars to fill. One car came and the boy and girl started unloading their fully packed car. I then realized that the portable storage unit and pile of stuff next to me was the college recycling center. I watched as clothes, dishes, chairs, lamps and utensils came out of the car. Many of the items I could have used at home. As I watched the growing recycle pile and the growing student piles to be moved, I thought back to my first year of college. I came to college with one suitcase with all of my clothes for the school year (including clothes for the winter with its minus 15 degrees). When I went home for the summer, all of my belongings plus a couple of books were in my suitcase. As I continued to watch, everyone had several items I never thought about having in college. As our pile grew to completion, I went back to the parking lot to get the car and hoped a parking space would be available.

When I got back to the dorm parking lot, one family with two compact cars had loaded up and they were leaving. I finally had a parking space. I discovered in the moving process that one Suburban holds more than two compact cars, which is very useful when trying to cram the last few items in.

Sitting on the bench remembering my days in college, I also started thinking about the changes in the dairy industry in the last 40 years. The most important stuff dairymen have accumulated are cows. When I was in college, the average dairy herd was 35 cows. Today the average is over 60 with many states over two hundred. Georgia's average is 285 cows per herd. With more cows, there has to be more feed, more space, more manure, more problems and more hired help. Management becomes more demanding and critical to success.

Forty years ago, most dairies in the south had a milking parlor and pastures. Grain was fed in the parlor and milk production was dependent on forage quality, forage availability and heat stress on the animals. Production dropped drastically in the summer. In the 1960's silage, especially corn silage was introduced to the dairy cows. This meant that feed storage and feeding areas had to be constructed. Today we have free stall barns with fans and cooling to keep the cows eating and milking. Of course there are many more structures and equipment for today's dairy to function. Many farms today spent more on electricity to run their fans than they use to spend to run their dairy. Production still drops in the summer, but many farms with facilities to modify the environment keep production fairly constant year

around.

The other area where we have seen a tremendous increase in stuff available to the dairyman is information. Much of this is related to the development of computing power, both mainframe computers and personal computers. Records use to be maintained on index cards that we could sort. Of course, one had to make sure to put the information on the cards so that it could be sorted and hopefully found. The breeding wheel was an innovation that allowed limited pertinent information to be displayed and the whole herd could be seen at a glance. Today we may have too much information available. The critical decision today is to isolate the important data to your decision making to find it when it is needed. Like my freshman daughter, today's dairy farmers have a lot more stuff than they had 40 years ago. How today's dairy farmer chooses to use this stuff will determine their success or failure.

Is Summer Acidosis Syndrome a Real Problem?

Joe W. West
Dairy Research and Extension

If you have heard of sub-acute ruminal acidosis (SARA) you may know that symptoms include reduced or inconsistent feed intake, reduced milk yield as well as reduced efficiency of yield, depressed milk fat test, poor body condition despite adequate energy intake, episodes of sore feet and laminitis, diarrhea and high culling rate (Nocek, 1987). Now, further observation reveals that summer heat stress may cause similar symptoms in dairy cattle that may be even greater in their severity. I coined a term called summer acidosis syndrome (SAS) to describe the problems that hot weather can impose on dairy cows. Many of the common practices recommended for heat-stressed dairy cows are based on the need to minimize the effects of acidosis during summer.

During summer cows are less able to buffer the acids that result from ruminal digestion and metabolism. Maintaining an adequate rumen pH is crucial to maintaining animal health, ruminal digestion and milk fat test. Classical research (Mishra et al., 1970) showed that during hot weather the ruminal pH was lower for cows fed either high concentrate or high forage diets than for cows fed identical diets during cool temperatures, indicating that cows were more challenged by acidosis in hot weather. It appears that maintaining adequate rumen and systemic buffering is necessary for high performance during hot weather.

There are several factors that predispose the cow to acidosis in summer. Panting by cows can actually lead to reduced blood buffer content, but choices by cows and by dairy managers can contribute to the problems as well. If cows are not adequately cooled or shaded they alter feeding behavior, eating less during the hot daytime hours and more at night when temperatures are cooler. This slug feeding, where cows eat fewer but larger meals, upsets the rumen balance because cows digest a large quantity of feed consumed in a short period of time, and produce large volumes of acid. If the feed bunk is overcrowded some cows will be restricted from feed, also contributing to subsequent slug feeding. What if the ration is coarse and easily sorted by cows? There is evidence that cows will select against fiber during hot weather and will choose to eat more of the small particle concentrates. That upsets the rumen balance, AND in the case of the overcrowded feed bunk, those cows who are forced to eat later may get an excess of the remaining coarse particles in the ration, depriving them of the high energy concentrate they need for production. Sometimes nutritionists feed too much grain (energy) in search of more milk when hot weather hits. Thus we feed rations that are very hot (high in fermentable

carbohydrate) at the very time when cows cannot adequately handle the acidic load. Finally, cows that are properly ruminating produce large quantities of buffer-containing saliva and are much more likely to maintain proper rumen pH and digestion.

There are several things that managers and nutritionists can do to minimize or eliminate the summer acidosis syndrome.

- Protect the cow from the hot environment. Shading and cooling are necessities and help to maintain intake, minimize panting and feeding behavior.
- Minimize sorting of feed ingredients by chopping very coarse particles and provide a well-blended total mixed ration using wet feeds, molasses, or added water to help bind the ration together.
- Minimize overcrowding. Hot weather is the time cows can least tolerate overcrowding, which can lead to restricted access to feed, slug feeding and excessive standing time.
- Think about what overcrowding and excessive standing does to foot problems, which are already more prevalent in hot weather!
- Feed rations which help maintain rumen health. Feeding too much grain and too little fiber in the search for milk can compromise cow health and actually reduce intake, defeating your purpose.
- Keep cows chewing. Adequate quantities of high quality fiber with adequate particle size will enhance rumen function and buffering. Have rations analyzed chemically for fiber content and check for adequate particle size using a particle separator.
- Avoid excessively 'hot' rations. Use high quality forages and fibrous by-products to replace some grain, thus reducing the total amount of starch fed, and use fats to increase dietary energy content.
- Use dietary cation-anion difference (DCAD) to improve the cow's ruminal and systemic buffering.
- Use products that stabilize the rumen environment and improve microbial function and digestion. Buffers, yeast products and probiotics have proven results and help to keep cows on feed and make the rumen work more efficiently. Use those products backed by scientific research.

Get started now! An ounce of prevention is truly worth a pound of cure, and establishing conditions to keep cows on feed and healthy before the worst of summer arrives is easier than trying to recover lost production.

Dairy Business Analysis Project
by Lane O. Ely¹, Albert deVries² and Russ Giesy²
¹ University of Georgia and ² University of Florida

We are in the middle of collecting the 2004 data for the Dairy Business analysis Project (DBAP). DBAP was started in 1996 to measure and document the financial performance of dairy business using standardized accounting measures.

In 2003, twenty-six dairies were included in the summary of results. To be included the cash flow, imbalance and equity of imbalance had to be less than 10%. Seventeen dairies were located in Florida and 9 in Georgia. Business size is presented in Table 1. The average number of cows was 1,316 (Florida – 1,363 and Georgia 1,229), milk sold per cow was 17,971 pounds (Florida- 16,770 and Georgia – 20,238), cows per worker was 55 (Florida – 59 and Georgia – 46) and cull rate was 40% (Florida – 39% and Georgia – 44%). The major difference between Florida and Georgia was milk sold per cow and cows per worker. The lower value for cows per worker in Georgia was the result of increased crop production on the Georgia farms versus the Florida farms.

Revenues and expenses are reported in Table 2 on a per cwt basis. The average value for milk sold was \$15.89 per cwt (Florida -\$16.05 and Georgia -\$15.60). Total revenue was \$17.66 (Florida - \$17.52 and Georgia- \$17.94). Georgia's total revenue was higher than Florida's because Georgia producers had a higher other income (crop, government and other) that offset the higher milk price in Florida.

Total expenses were \$18.27 per cwt (Florida -\$18.28 and Georgia -\$18.24). The major expense categories were feed (\$7.16), personnel (\$3.22), livestock (\$1.95), depreciation (\$1.62) and milk marketing (\$1.11). Net farm income for 2003 was \$-0.51 per cwt. Table 3 and 4 have report data on the economic performance parameters for the dairies. 2003 was a year of low milk prices that slowly rose but expenses were high as the previous two years had low milk prices.

If you would like to participate in the collection of data for 2004, please contact Lane Ely at 706-542-9107 or by email (laneely@uga.edu)

Table 1. DBAP 2003 Summary - Business size and production efficiency by state and overall average, median, and standard deviation.

Category	Average	Overall		State Averages	
		Median	Std ¹	Florida	Georgia
Number of farms	26	26	26	17	9
Business Size					
Average number of cows	1,316	823	1,276	1,363	1,228
Average number of heifers	619	376	790	739	394
Milk sold (million lbs)	24.69	14.04	25.66	24.19	25.64
FTE workers	24	15	24	25	24
Acres of pasture + cultivated land	732	421	632	796	610
Production Efficiency					
Milk sold / cow (lbs)	17,971	18,214	3,355	16,770	20,238
Cows / FTE worker	55	56	22	59	46
Milk sold / FTE worker (million lbs)	0.96	0.93	0.38	0.99	0.92
Cull rate	0.40	0.36	0.16	0.39	0.44

Table 2. DBAP 2003 Summary - Revenues and expenses by state and overall average, median, and standard deviation.

Category	Overall			State Averages	
	Average	Median	Std ¹	Florida	Georgia
Number of farms	26	26	26	17	9
Revenues (per cwt)					
Milk sold (\$)	15.89	15.91	0.70	16.05	15.60
Raised, leased cow sales (\$)	0.36	0.32	0.91	0.41	0.26
Heifer sales (\$)	0.25	0.14	0.69	0.24	0.29
Gain on purchased livestock sales (\$)	0.19	0.01	0.94	0.21	0.16
Other revenues (\$)	0.97	0.59	1.27	0.62	1.63
Total revenues (\$)	17.66	17.44	1.58	17.52	17.94
Expenses (per cwt)					
Personnel (\$)	3.22	2.94	1.46	3.43	2.83
Purchased feed (\$)	7.16	7.06	1.27	7.43	6.64
Crops (\$)	0.43	0.27	0.56	0.25	0.79
Machinery (\$)	0.82	0.76	0.46	0.87	0.70
Livestock (\$)	1.95	1.82	0.80	1.87	2.10
Milk marketing (\$)	1.11	1.00	0.35	0.93	1.45
Buildings and land (\$)	0.52	0.37	0.76	0.42	0.72
Interest (\$)	0.49	0.36	0.55	0.56	0.36
Depreciation:					
Livestock (\$)	0.92	0.61	0.94	0.97	0.81
Machinery (\$)	0.49	0.45	0.34	0.42	0.62
Buildings (\$)	0.21	0.14	0.22	0.16	0.31
Other expenses (\$)	0.94	0.89	0.44	0.96	0.90
Total expenses (\$)	18.27	18.04	2.20	18.28	18.24
Net farm income from operations (\$)	(0.61)	(0.76)	2.69	(0.77)	(0.30)
Gain on sale of capital assets (\$)	0.09	0.00	0.51	0.14	0.01
Net farm income (\$)	(0.51)	(0.33)	2.82	(0.63)	(0.29)

Table.3. DBAP 2003 Summary - Financial performance by state and overall average, median, and standard deviation.

Category	Overall			State Averages	
	Average	Median	Std ¹	Florida	Georgia
Number of farms	26	26	26	17	9
Liquidity					
Current ratio	2.01	0.63	4.04	1.48	3.00
Working capital	(161,312)	(41,242)	778,878	(172,449)	(140,275)
Solvency					
Debt to asset ratio	0.41	0.39	0.26	0.40	0.43
Equity to asset ratio	0.59	0.61	0.26	0.60	0.57
Debt to equity ratio ¹	(173.91)	0.62	895.28	0.88	(504.07)
Profitability					
Rate of return on assets	(0.01)	(0.03)	0.09	(0.01)	(0.01)
Rate of return on equity	(0.18)	(0.06)	0.60	(0.03)	(0.48)
Operating profit margin ratio	(0.06)	(0.05)	0.18	(0.06)	(0.05)
Financial efficiency					
Asset turnover rate	0.70	0.69	0.41	0.66	0.78
Operating expense ratio	0.92	0.90	0.17	0.93	0.90
Depreciation expense ratio	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.09	0.10
Interest expense ratio	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.02
Net farm income ratio	(0.04)	(0.04)	0.16	(0.06)	(0.02)
Repayment capacity					
Cash flow coverage ratio	0.27	0.13	4.87	(0.67)	2.04
Term debt coverage ratio ²	0.32	0.00	2.71	0.35	0.26
Capital replacement margin ³	(143,812)	(55,854)	892,392	(142,134)	(146,981)

¹ One dairy with a very small negative equity had a very large negative debt to equity ratio

² Term debt and capital lease coverage ratio

³ Capital replacement and term debt repayment margin

Table 4. DBAP 2003 Summary - Balance sheet by state and overall average, median, and standard deviation.

Category	Overall			State Averages	
	Average	Median	Std ¹	Florida	Georgia
Number of farms	26	26	26	17	9
Balance sheet (January 1)					
Current assets / cow (\$)	491	281	455	358	742
Total assets / cow (\$)	5,902	4,470	3,737	5,450	6,757
Current liabilities / cow (\$)	654	412	670	677	610
Total liabilities / cow (\$)	1,905	1,665	1,365	1,940	1,840
Equity / cow (\$)	3,997	2,274	4,119	3,510	4,917
Balance sheet (December 31)					
Current assets / cow (\$)	447	337	367	358	615
Total assets / cow (\$)	6,294	4,329	5,174	5,391	8,000
Current liabilities / cow (\$)	544	338	562	572	491
Total liabilities / cow (\$)	2,023	1,939	1,297	1,826	2,394
Equity / cow (\$)	4,271	2,319	5,535	3,565	5,606

The DHI Program Has Changed in the Last 100 Years

**By Dr. Warren Gilson
Extension Dairy Scientist**

This year marks the 100th anniversary for the Dairy Herd Improvement (DHI) program in the United States. The program originated in Michigan in 1905 when a Danish immigrant, Helmer Rabild, met with a group of dairy farmers.

The program draws its beginnings to the late 1800's, when the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) advocated the weighing of milk. With the development of the Babcock test, in 1890, it also became possible to measure the fat in the milk. The various breed associations adopted official testing in the early 1900's. Since then, the program has evolved to include much more than production records.

The program has changed so much over the years that those people who originated the program probably would not recognize it. DHI was the first non-governmental group to use computers. I know this seems strange, but the processing center in Utah first used computers in 1951 to calculate production records.

The DHI program today includes much more than just production records. It has become a repository of information upon which to base management decisions plus a system for organizing this information. Managers today rely on this information available through DHI on a daily basis for managing their herds.

The first management reports included: heat check lists, cows due to dry off and cows due to calve. These lists focused on the specific cows which needed attention. Other lists were developed as producers and their advisors identified areas where they would like assistance in management.

Technology has also been adapted for use in the DHI program. The use of hand-held devices has become commonplace on the dairy farm by both producers and technicians. No longer is the

information written down multiple times before it entered into the database.

Processing centers are continuing to search for new ways in which to enhance the DHI program and make it more valuable to producers. Efforts are currently underway to integrate Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) into the DHI program. This will become invaluable as the industry adopts RFID technology for all animal identification.

Protocols are also becoming an important part of the DHI package. These applications will allow producers to develop specific procedures that will be followed by a specific group of cows or heifers within the herd. By establishing protocols, producers can provide detailed instructions to employees relating to the daily management of individual animals.

The DHI program has changed significantly over the last 100 years and will change even more in the next 100 years. Just as the founders of DHI would not recognize the program today, we will not recognize it in the future. Evaluate your management today to see if you are taking full advantage of the information available through DHI. Contact your technician, county extension agent or extension specialist for assistance to taking full advantage of the DHI program as it continues to evolve.

What Does Agrosecurity Mean to the Dairy Industry?

John K. Bernard
Dairy Research and Extension

Agrosecurity is a new term to many of us, but we will be hearing a lot more about it the future. Agriculture has been concerned with biosecurity for years; however, the concept of agrosecurity goes beyond that. Agrosecurity is defined as “the use of all possible means and procedures to guard against deliberate or incidental harm to an agricultural or food facility”. After 9/11, the security of our food supply and economy has received greater emphasis and agriculture is vital to a healthy economy in the United States. In 2004, the combined value of crop and livestock commodities was approximately \$233 billion. Also, many people are employed by industries involved in processing, distributing or marketing agricultural products or in the production of supplies and equipment used for producing food and fiber.

After 9/11, President Bush established the Department of Homeland Security. The primary missions of this department are to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage from potential attacks and natural disasters. Homeland Security Presidential Directive No. 9 establishes a national policy to defend the agriculture and our food system against terrorist attacks, major disasters and other emergencies. This directive ensures that U.S. agriculture and food remain protected and viable, and directs all agencies to work together in this effort. Other directives related to agriculture and the food system established a national incident management system to respond to emergencies as well as develop a system for providing the critical infrastructure and necessary assistance.

One of the primary goals of agrosecurity is to develop awareness of the risk and practice good biosecurity. There are several areas of concern related to agriculture such as the introduction of foreign animal or plant diseases (ex. foot and mouth disease), food tampering or the use of agricultural products for terrorism (ex. ammonia nitrate for bombs). Accordingly, livestock producers should develop and adopt strict biosecurity programs to prevent the introduction and spread of diseases. This is not a new concept to dairy and beef producers as the need for biosecurity programs have been emphasized for years to prevent the introduction of diseases common to the USA. But, we must also be aware of the

potential for someone to intentionally introduce a foreign animal disease. Even the suggestion that a disease was introduced in an area will disrupt domestic and export markets.

Producers must take extra precautions to secure supplies such as pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, and pharmaceuticals used for treating animals. Unfortunately, there are too many cases in which fertilizer have been used for producing drugs or making bombs. Many have expressed concern about the potential for someone to use other agricultural products to contaminate the food or water supply or poison animals and people. Missing items such as these should immediately be reported to local law enforcement officials.

Another area addressed by these directives relates to natural disasters such as hurricanes and tornados. When a natural disaster occurs, the local or state emergency management system are activated. These individuals are charged with preventing others from being injured as well as restoring or maintaining order. Depending on the situation, this could mean that delivery of feed, fuel or other supplies, as well as operation of milk trucks can be delayed as was the case in Florida last year after the hurricanes.

It is important that emergency management personnel have adequate information and an understanding of the needs of dairies, as well as other agricultural enterprises, so they can make informed decisions. Currently, most states have active agrosecurity training programs for local and state emergency management personnel to help them become more familiar with agriculture. Many county extension personnel will be working with their local emergency management personnel to help them learn more about normal operations in their county and needs if a natural disaster were to occur.

What should individual dairy producers do in regards to agrosecurity? Producers should keep up to date on agrosecurity and biosecurity issues in their region. They should also take steps to improve the security of their operation including reviewing and updating biosecurity protocols and providing a secure storage facility for fertilize, pesticides and herbicides. Producers should also become informed about emergency management operations in their county and develop an emergency plan for dealing with a natural disaster or other crises. If you do not have one, you should purchase a weather alert radio to keep informed when storms occur. When a hurricane or a winter storm is predicted, producers should have secure adequate supplies such as feed, water, and fuel available plus an emergency generator so they can take care of animals for several days. Do not forget to plan for taking care of family and employees as these are the most important assets you have.

Dawgs Top Dairy Judging
Jillian Fain and Dr. Bill Graves
Animal and Dairy Science Department

After a disappointing start with a trip to Maryland and the cancellation of the Pennsylvania contest due to hurricane Ivan, the UGA Dairy Judging Team, coached by Jillian Fain and Dr. Bill Graves, truly made its' mark at the 2004 Intercollegiate Dairy Judging Contests. In late September, the team traveled to Madison, Wisconsin, to compete in the Judging Contest at World Dairy Expo where 25 teams competed with over 100 contestants. Awards received included 3rd high team Judging Jersey Cattle, 5th high team Linear Evaluation, 8th high individual Linear Evaluation - Brian Edger, and 11th high individual Judging Milking Shorthorn Cattle - Tara Klewein. This team placed higher than any UGA team participating in Madison the past 23 years!

The team traveled the following weekend to compete in the Mid-South Fair Judging Contest in Memphis, Tennessee. Major team achievements included 1st place team Judging Holstein Cattle, 2nd high team in oral reasons, 3rd high team overall, 2nd high individual overall – Joan Jackson, and 3rd high individual overall – Brian Edger.

On November 7th, the team then competed in the North American International Livestock Exposition Judging Contest held in Louisville, Kentucky. The 2004 contest was host to 18 teams and over 70 contestants. The team ranked 11th high in the contest, falling short of 10th place by a mere 3 points. Rising above teams in the rankings that UGA has never before overcome. In addition to this accomplishment, the team also ranked 8th high in Brown Swiss, 9th high in Guernsey, and 9th high in Holsteins. Several team members also shined individually escalating in the ranks to the top 25. These included: Brian Edger-19th High Individual Overall, Brian Edger-14th High Individual Brown Swiss cattle, Tara Klewein-22nd High Individual Guernsey cattle, Tara Klewein-17th High Individual in Holstein cattle, Brian Edger-19th High Individual in Holstein cattle, and Daniel Williams-21st High Individual in Jersey cattle. The team was delighted with these results to conclude the 2004 team's season of success. In addition, they are thrilled to know they have been the most successful team to represent the University of Georgia across the nation in Intercollegiate Dairy Cattle Judging Contests. The 2004 team consisted of Brian Edger, Jennifer Hagen, Joan Jackson, Tara Klewein and Daniel Williams.



Thanks to everyone for your support of the 2004 UGA Dairy Judging Team! An additional thank you goes out to Lee and Curtis Strange, Joseph Pritchett, David Moss, Steve Waggoner and Bobby Smith for all their help with practices.

TOP 20 DHIA HERDS BY TEST DAY MILK PRODUCTION

Herd	County	Br.	Mo.	Cows	Test Day Average				Yearly Average				
					% Days in Milk	Fat			Fat			Protein	
						Milk	%	Lbs.	Milk	%	Lbs.	%	Lbs.
Vista Farm	Jefferson	H	3	85	100	88.8	2.7	2.42	23698	3.4	811	3.0	711
Dave Clark	Morgan	H	3	854	91	84.8*	3.0	2.51	25311	3.3	835	2.9	745
Williams Dairy	Morgan	H	3	521	93	84.0*	3.2	2.72	26027	3.8	984	3.0	786
Williams Dairy	Telliferro	H	3	124	95	81.2	3.3	2.64	22551	3.6	809	3.0	671
Martin L.L.P.	Hart	H	3	307	96	76.9	3.7	2.86	22544	3.6	810	3.0	671
Ray Lovett	Peirce	H	2	356	96	76.6*	2.9	2.23	21524	3.1	677	3.0	643
Mark D Brenneman and Sons	Macon	H	3	116	97	75.9	3.0	2.26	19529	3.3	653	3.1	607
Rodgers' Hillcrest Farms Inc.	McDuffie	H	3	385	95	74.8	2.7	2.01	22769	3.3	746	3.0	690
Agri-Fresh Dairy	Laurens	H	3	205	95	74.7*	3.3	2.48	23923	3.2	771	3.0	710
Gin Branch Farm	Laurens	H	2	60	93	74.4*	2.8	2.09	22872	3.5	800	3.0	689
Cecil Dueck	Jefferson	H	3	72	100	74.0	3.6	2.69	23687	3.7	875	3.0	711
Lee Whitaker	McDuffie	H	3	365	96	73.9	3.6	2.63	21002	3.6	753	3.1	642
Larry Moody	Ware	H	2	984	91	73.1			21783				
Brenneman Farms	Macon	H	3	106	98	72.6	3.0	2.18	19306	3.0	573	3.1	591
Gene Bowen	Peirce	H	3	204	95	72.2*			19071				
Larry Moody	Ware	H	3	986	89	72.1			21964				
Krulic Dairy Farm Inc.	Screven	H	3	128	91	71.7	3.4	2.45	23771	3.1	681	3.1	734
Ray Lovett	Peirce	H	3	344	94	71.1*	2.8	2.01	21736	3.1	681	3.0	649
Earnest R Turk	Putnam	H	3	370	96	70.5	4.0	2.81	21672	4.0	872	3.1	662
Anthony's Dairy	Sumter	H	3	848	91	70.4*	3.6	2.54	21006	3.9	809	2.9	616

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 (Raleigh, NC).

TOP 20 DHIA HERDS BY TEST DAY FAT PRODUCTION

Herd	County	Br.	Mo.	Cows	Test Day Average				Yearly Average				
					% Days in Milk	Fat			Fat			Protein	
						Milk	%	Lbs.	Milk	%	Lbs.	%	Lbs.
Martin Dairy L.L.P.	Hart	H	3	307	96	76.9	3.7	2.86	22544	3.6	810	3.0	671
Berry College Dairy	Floyd	J	3	28	96	53.4	5.3	2.82	18598	5.0	934	3.6	665
Earnest Turk	Putnam	H	3	370	96	70.5	4.0	2.81	21672	4.0	872	3.1	662
Williams Dairy	Morgan	H	3	521	93	84.0*	3.2	2.72	26027	3.8	984	3.0	786
Ed Boehs	Jefferson	H	3	77	99	67.4	4.0	2.72	21125	3.7	789	3.1	648
Cecil Dueck	Jefferson	H	3	72	100	74.0	3.6	2.69	23687	3.7	875	3.0	711
David L Moss	Morgan	H	3	120	95	65.2	4.1	2.69	19550	4.3	832	3.0	587
Bagwell Dairy	Polk	H	3	82	90	66.8*	4.0	2.68	16960	3.8	650	3.2	538
Williams Dairy	Morgan	H	3	124	95	81.2	3.3	2.64	22551	3.6	809	3.0	671
Lee Whitaker	McDuffie	H	3	365	96	73.9	3.6	2.63	21002	3.6	753	3.1	642
Lawayne Weaver	Macon	H	3	145	96	67.6	3.9	2.63	19683	3.8	740	3.2	626
Anthony's Dairy	Sumter	H	3	848	91	70.4*	3.6	2.54	21006	3.9	809	2.9	616
Ray Ward Dairy	Putnam	H	3	134	96	69.9	3.6	2.54	21151	3.7	793	2.9	621
Russell Johnston	Morgan	H	3	101	89	62.5	4.1	2.54	20512	3.9	794	3.2	648
J B Gay & Son	Jenkins	H	3	285	97	70.1	3.6	2.53	20994				
Eugene King	Macon	H	3	90	99	69.9	3.6	2.53	19919	3.7	731	3.1	623
Dave Clark	Morgan	H	3	854	91	84.8*	3.0	2.51	25311	3.3	835	2.9	745
Roberts Dairy Inc.	Jones	H	2	144	97	65.5	3.8	2.50	17462	4.0	696	3.1	544
Aurora Dairy Georgia-LLC	Mitchell	H	3	3505	90	65.1*	3.8	2.50	20285	3.8	763	3.0	612
W.T. Meriwether	Morgan	H	3	111	95	64.7	3.8	2.49	17709	4.0	707	3.1	553

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 (Raleigh, NC).

TOP 20 DHIA HERDS BY TEST DAY MILK PRODUCTION

Herd	County	Br.	Mo.	Cows	Test Day Average				Yearly Average				
					% Days in Milk	Milk	Fat		Milk	Fat		Protein	
							%	Lbs.		%	Lbs.	%	Lbs.
Dave Clark	Morgan	H	4	871	92	87.2*	2.8	2.45	25544	3.3	837	2.9	750
Williams Dairy	Morgan	H	4	519	93	82.0*	3.7	3.00	26148	3.7	978	3.0	794
Vista Farms	Jefferson	H	4	83	100	81.1	2.7	2.21	24011	3.3	804	3.0	722
Martin Dairy L.L.P.	Hart	H	4	300	94	79.4	3.5	2.75	22928	3.6	828	3.0	683
Agri-Fresh Dairy	Laurens	H	4	197	97	76.7*	3.4	2.64	23862	3.3	776	3.0	709
Williams Dairy	Morgan	H	4	123	95	76.1	3.5	2.64	23159	3.6	826	3.0	692
Krulic Dairy Farm, Inc.	Screven	H	4	127	94	75.9	3.4	2.60	24023	3.7	884	3.1	742
Cecil Dueck	Jefferson	H	4	76	99	74.8	3.3	2.50	23938	3.7	881	3.0	720
Rodgers' Hillcrest Farms Inc.	McDuffie	H	4	382	93	72.8	3.2	2.31	23022	3.21	738	3.0	698
Larry Mood	Ware	H	4	986	89	71.7			22176				
Ray Ward Dairy	Putnam	H	4	135	98	71.4	3.6	2.54	21367	3.7	797	2.9	629
Lee Whitaker	McDuffie	H	4	378	96	71.2	3.6	2.59	21148	3.6	755	3.1	629
Tim Groff	Burke	H	4	64	95	69.9	2.5	1.76					
Scott Glover	White	H	4	99	92	69.8	3.9	2.71	22382	3.9	863	3.0	667
Gin Branch Farm	Laurens	H	4	59	88	69.4*	3.1	2.13	22749	3.4	773	3.0	682
Gene Bowen	Peirce	H	4	245	96	69.1*			19625				
Eugene King	Macon	H	4	94	99	68.6	3.5	2.37	19748	3.7	726	3.1	621
Brooksco Dairy	Brooks	H	4	2511	89	68.6*			22160				
Mark E. Yoder	Macon	H	4	119	91	68.2	3.2	2.21	22167	3.4	750	3.1	682
Mark D. Brenneaman and Sons	Macon	H	4	120	98	68.0	3.0	2.04	20034	3.3	666	3.1	625

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 (Raleigh, NC).

TOP 20 DHIA HERDS BY TEST DAY FAT PRODUCTION

Herd	County	Br.	Mo.	Cows	Test Day Average				Yearly Average				
					% Days in Milk	Fat			Fat			Protein	
						Milk	%	Lbs.	Milk	%	Lbs.	%	Lbs.
Williams Dairy	Morgan	H	4	519	93	82.0*	3.7	3.00	26148	3.7	978	3.0	794
Berry College Dairy	Floyd	J	4	28	100	63.7	4.6	2.94	18526	5.0	929	3.6	658
Martin Dairy L.L.P.	Hart	H	4	300	94	79.4	3.5	2.75	22928	3.6	828	3.0	683
Scott Glover	White	H	4	99	92	69.8	3.9	2.71	22382	3.9	863	3.0	667
Agri-Fresh Dairy	Laurens	H	4	197	97	76.7*	3.4	2.64	23862	3.3	776	3.0	709
Williams Dairy	Morgan	H	4	123	95	76.1	3.5	2.64	23159	3.6	826	3.0	692
David L Moss	Morgan	H	4	116	93	64.0	4.1	2.64	19775	4.3	845	3.0	593
Krulic Dairy Farm, Inc.	Screven	H	4	127	84	75.9	3.4	2.60	24023	3.7	884	3.1	742
Lee Whitaker	McDuffie	H	3	378	86	71.2	3.6	2.59	21148	3.6	755	3.1	646
Aurora Dairy Georgia -LLC	Mitchell	H	4	3574	95	67.5*	3.8	2.55	20355	3.7	763	3.0	613
Ray Ward Dairy	Putnam	H	4	135	98	71.4	3.6	2.54	21367	3.7	797	2.9	629
Cecil Dueck	Jefferson	H	4	76	99	74.8	3.3	2.50	23938	3.7	881	3.0	720
Andy Wheat	Morgan	H	4	142	100	67.6	3.7	2.48	19694	3.4	676	2.9	580
Dave Clark	Morgan	H	4	871	92	87.2*	2.8	2.45	25544	3.3	837	2.9	750
Ed Boehs	Jefferson	H	4	78	95	65.2	3.7	2.44	21107	3.08	794	3.1	648
Irvin Yoder	Macon	H	4	115	89	65.7	3.6	2.39	22439	3.6	812	3.1	688
Eugene King	Macon	H	4	94	99	68.6	3.5	2.37	19748	3.7	726	3.1	621
Al & Richard Kinder	Hart	H	4	327	97	63.0	3.7	2.33	20258	3.5	711	3.0	615
Rodger's Hillcrest Farms, Inc.	McDuffie	H	4	382	93	72.8	3.2	2.31	23022	3.2	738	3.0	698
R & D Dairy	Laurens	H	4	29	90	64.6*	3.6	2.31					

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 (Raleigh, NC).