LSU AgCenter
Research & Extension

Dairy Science Department
Dairy Science Building
LSU AgCenter
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
(225)578-4141
Fax: (225)578-4008
Website: www.lsuagcenter.com

EXTENSION PROGRAMS
Agriculture
Economic/Community Development
Environment/Natural Resources
Families/Nutrition/Health
4-H Youth Programs

Louisianana Dairy Digest

Your Herd Management Resource

Dairy Specialists:
Dr. Gary Hay
Dr. Charles Hutchison
225-578-4411

Dairy Herd Improvement
Joe Trabeaux
Mark Williams
225-578-6099

March-April 2005

Dairy Market News

Dr. Bill Herndon, Dept. of Ag. Econ.
Mississippi State University

February and March Advanced Class I Prices Still Showing Mixed Markets

Class I milk prices fell abruptly in February due to the sharp drop off in cheese prices when cash cheese prices plummeted by more than 25% in December. Many dairy traders expected this "market correction" as demand ebbed when schools closed for the Christmas holidays. However, raw milk remains somewhat tight at the onset of 2005 and dairy product prices are showing tremendous strength. One of the most interesting and welcomed factors is a surge in international demand for U.S. nonfat dry milk (NDM). After languishing at or near price support levels during recent years, NDM prices are up by 15% and are approaching $1.00 per pound. The good news is that milk prices are currently almost 20% above the average for the past 25 years.

The Class I mover for February was the Class III Advanced skim milk price (based on the value of skim milk used in cheddar cheese production) because it was greater than the corresponding Class IV price (representing skim milk value in butter and milk powder products). The February 2005 Advanced Class III skim milk price was $7.97 per hundredweight (cwt.) compared to the Advanced Class IV Skim Milk price of $6.68 per cwt. These prices resulted in an Advanced Class I "base" price of $13.79 per cwt using Class III advanced prices vs. $12.55 per cwt using Class IV advanced prices. Therefore, the USDA announced on January 21 that the February Advanced Class I "base" milk price would be $13.79 per cwt. (for 3.5% butterfat milk). The Advanced Class I milk price in Mississippi and Louisiana for February 2005 was $**16.89** per cwt after adding the $3.10 Class I price differential for the pricing zone which includes Atlanta, Ga,. This represents a decrease of $2.86 per cwt. below the corresponding January price of $**19.75**.

The Class I mover for March 2005 was the Class III Advanced skim milk price (based on the value of skim milk used in cheddar cheese production) because it was greater than the corresponding Class IV price (representing skim milk value in butter and milk powder products). The March 2005 Advanced Class III skim milk price was $9.59 per hundredweight (cwt.) compared to $6.74 per cwt for the Advanced Class IV skim milk price. These prices resulted in an Advanced Class I "base" price of $15.43 per cwt using Class III advanced prices vs. $12.68 per cwt using Class IV advanced prices. Therefore, the USDA announced on February 18 that the March Advanced Class I "base" milk price would be $15.43 per cwt. The Advanced Class I milk price in Mississippi and Louisiana for March 2005 was $18.53 per cwt after adding the $3.10 Class I price differential for the pricing zone which includes Atlanta, Ga,. This represents an increase of $1.64 per cwt. (+9.7%) above the corresponding February price of $16.89.

Dairy producers need to remember that the Class I price will be an important, but not the only, factor influencing revenues derived from the sale of their milk produced during the months of February and March since about 50-75 percent of Mississippi and Louisiana milk is usually processed into Class I products.

Market Conditions

Dairy market analysts continue to be hard pressed to explain why cheese prices increase while butter prices fall during one week, only to see the opposite price movements in the subsequent week. Traders are reacting to a wide variety of supply and demand information in a dairy market that is rapidly changing and tittering between the perceptions of shortages versus surpluses of raw milk supplies. As is the usual trend, dairy product demand falls to its lowest levels after the Christmas holidays and Super Bowl and this period coincides with growing milk output produced during the spring 'flush." Thus, the late winter and early spring months normally see milk prices tumble to their lowest levels of the year. However, the current demand and supply situation is very confused as both dairy consumption and milk production are being influenced by surging international demand and declining number of milk cows from programs like CWT as well as the Canadian border closure. So, milk and dairy product prices are standing on the edge of a ledge waiting for something to push them even higher or to send them plummeting.

The USDA's December 31, 2004 Cold Storage report shows that total inventories of butter fell 9% between November and December and were 48% less than December 2003. Commercial holdings of various types of natural cheeses on December 31, 2004 ranged between 1% less and 2% more than November 30 totals and declined to between 3% to 5% less than last December 2003 inventories. However, government owned stocks of butter declined to only 143,000 pounds in December 2004 versus 6,172,000 in December 2003. Government cheese stocks were 47% less in December 2004 than in December 2003.

As of early February, dairy processors appear to be preparing for the lull in dairy demand and awaiting the flood of raw milk supplies as the spring flush commences. Market conditions continue to perplex traders with cheese and butter prices moving in opposite directions. For example, between January 28 and February 4, cheddar cheese prices plunged by more than 25 cents per pound while butter prices rose by almost 10 cents per pound. It now appears that diminishing U.S. dairy demand and bulging spring milk supplies are being offset by vigorous international NDM demand and this is sustaining milk price outlook for most of 2005.

Verification of the onslaught of spring milk supplies is normally first confirmed in Florida where mild, spring weather occurs before other regions of the country. During the first week of February, Florida handlers switched from importing milk to exporting milk supplies with 129 tanker loads being exported from the state compared to exporting 130 tankers the previous week and versus exporting 85 loads during the same week of 2004.

The market tone remains "confused" as both traders and analysts try to digest the "bullish" factors related to increasing NDM prices and declining milk cow numbers along with the "bearish" elements of ebbing demand and swelling spring milk supplies. Despite the uncertain market psychology, March 2005 Class I prices were expected to benefit from the rise in cheese prices in early January and shoot up by about $1.00 per cwt. to the $18.00 range. Class I milk prices are then expected to trend down gradually over the next three to four months by $1.50 to $2.00 per cwt. and be reported in May near $16.00 per cwt. for the Atlanta zone. Dairy farmers are not likely to enjoy $20-plus per cwt. milk prices again in 2005, but the outlook for milk prices is much improved and many dairy analysts are predicting milk prices to average about $1.00 to $1.50 per cwt. less than the record high level set during 2004. Despite the hopes of the dairy farmers, price volatility and market uncertainty will continue to cause extreme stress to the industry.

Milk Production

In December, national milk production recorded an increase in output compared to the same month in the previous year for the sixth month in a row. However, the increases in milk cow numbers witnessed over most of 2004 are showing signs of slowing. Poor weather conditions, especially in California, are also showing signs of slowing milk output per cow. For the first time since June, milk production per cow grew by less than 10 pounds per cow. The number of U.S. dairy cows fell by 9,000 head between November and December. The Cooperative Working Together (CWT) initiative removed almost 50,500 dairy cows during its second herd retirement program conducted in December and January. The May 2003 discovery of BSE in Canada closed the border to all live cattle imports and dairy replacements that averaged more than 75,000 head per year. Even if the USDA does open our border to Canadian cattle has planned on March 7, this plan does NOT affect dairy cattle because of the requirement that all imported cattle must be slaughtered before they reach 30 months of age. Comparing December 2004 to December 2003 statistics finds that milk output grew by 93 (0.7%) million pounds and that there were 17,000 (+0.2%) more cows in the U.S. herd and productivity per cow grew by 7 (+0.4%) pounds per cow. The major western milk producing states continued to add cows to their dairy farms, but New Mexico showed a decline of 3,000 head in dairy cow numbers. The USDA reports that California added 44,000 cows; Idaho added 23,000 cows; and Arizona added 11,000 cows. The table below indicates that milk production in the U.S. grew by 0.1% in 2004 versus 2003. However, milk production in Louisiana, Mississippi and the entire southeast U.S. fell substantially again in 2004.

What Does it Cost You to Produce Milk?

Dr. Gary M. Hay, Dept. of Dairy Science
LSU AgCenter

The February 2005 DHIA test information from the LSU dairy farm yields an interesting comparison on the cost of milk production. The LSU herd is divided into three different ration or feeding groups: high producing cows, first calf heifers and low producing cows. The following table includes the production, income, feed cost and income over feed costs numbers for February 2005. The milk price used is the Advanced Class I price of $13.79 for February.

HERD	Milk per Cow per Day	Income per Cow per Day	Feed Cost per Cow per Day	Feed Cost per Cwt	IOFC per Cow per Day	IOFC per Cwt
High Cows	97 lbs	$13.38	$4.34	$4.43	$9.04	$9.36
Heifers	72 lbs	$9.93	$3.82	$5.31	$6.11	$8.48
Low Cows	40 lbs	$5.52	$2.63	$6.54	$2.89	$7.25

This table provides some interesting insights into the economics of milk production. According to our actual production data, ***feed cost per cow per day*** was $1.71 higher ($4.34 - $2.63) in our high producing group than in our low producing group. However, ***feed cost per cwt of milk*** for the high producing group was $2.11 ***LOWER*** ($6.54 - $4.43) than the feed cost per cwt of milk for the low producing group. Even though it cost us $1.71 more per cow per day to feed our high cows; the feed cost to produce 100 lbs of milk in the high producing group was actually $2.11 less than the cost to produce 100 lbs of milk in the low producing group.

The second interesting insight involves ***income over feed cost per cow per day.*** Even though it cost $1.71 more per cow per day to feed the high producing group, our income over feed cost for the high producing group was $6.15 higher than the income over feed cost per cow per day in the low producing group ($9.04 - $2.89) It is easy to understand that if you produce more milk per cow you will increase your ***total income***. However, as this example shows, producing more milk per cow can also substantially increase your **NET** income.

Finally, income over feed cost for the high producing group was $9.36 per cwt versus $7.25 per cwt for the low producing group. The high producing group produced $2.11 more income over feed costs for every cwt of milk produced than the low producing group. Not only did the high producing cows produce more cwts to sell, they also generated an additional $2.11 income over feed cost on every cwt sold than the low producing cows. This increased profitability is constant no matter what the milk price. Whether milk is $12 per cwt or $20 per cwt, the high producing cows will still generate an additional $2.11 more in income over feed cost per cwt than the low producing cows.

The final message: production costs on a dairy farm are not just a function of what you spend, but how you spend it. ***The number of cwts of milk produced per cow has a significant impact on your profitability.*** Increasing your production per cow will not only increase your total income, it will also increase your net income by lowering your cost per cwt. What does it cost you to produce a cwt of milk? For more information on calculating your cost of production contact your county agent or the LSU Department of Dairy Science at 225-578-4411.

Dairy Farm Numbers Decline in 2004

The number of licensed US dairy operations fell during 2004, according to the January 2005 USDA “Milk Production” report. Last year, there were 66,830 US dairy herds licensed to sell milk — a loss of 3,545 operations since 2003.

USDA adds Three States to Milk-Production Report

The USDA added the states of Colorado, Kansas and Oregon to the list of top-milk-producing states. They will be included in the USDA’s monthly milk-production reports. These top-23 dairy states account for ***91*** percent of US milk production.

Louisiana Dairy Production Figures for 2004

Figures for the economic impact of the dairy industry in Louisiana were recently released by the LSU AgCenter. The table below lists the figures for 2004 as compared to the figures for 2003. For more detailed data online, go to **http://www.lsuagcenter.com**.

Year	Herds	Cows	Total Milk (lbs)	Gross Farm Value of Milk	Milk per Cow (lbs)	US Milk per Cow
2003	334	40,815	510,492,870	$66,313,024	12,507	18,608
2004	308	36,768	469,697,519	$77,406,151	12,775	18,957

Southern Marketing Agency Producer Incentive Programs

The Southern Marketing Agency recently announced a new producer incentive program designed to encourage increased milk production in the southeast orders. Dr. Bill Herndon, Dept. of Agricultural Economics, Mississippi State University, recently developed an EXCEL spreadsheet to help dairy producers analyze the probable revenues generated for signing a contract to participate in the program. A copy of the spreadsheet can be downloaded from **http://www.louisianalivestock.org/dairy/financial.htm.** For help in analyzing your herd using the spreadsheet contact your county agent or the LSU Department of Dairy Science at 225-578-4411.

Evaluating Bulk Tank Milk Quality

Dr. Charles F. Hutchison, Dept. of Dairy Science
LSU AgCenter

Dairy producers marketing their milk through a Southern Marketing Association member will have a new milk quality incentive program that includes Bulk Tank Preliminary Incubation Count (BTPIC) sometime during 2005. The demand for higher quality milk comes from retailers and major food service companies that supply milk and dairy products to consumers. Consumers demand a product that has consistent quality, good taste and a long shelf life. Meeting these demands will ultimately benefit dairy producers by increasing consumption of these types of high quality products.

In order to meet this demand, dairy producers should strive to produce the highest quality product possible. Producing a high quality product not only helps boost or maintain fluid milk consumption (which increases Class I utilization), but the incentive payments for meeting the various quality standards can be essential in improving the profitability of a dairy operation. Therefore, it is important to understand what factors may interfere with milk quality.

One measure of milk quality is the bacteria content of the raw milk. This is often termed the raw count or the Bulk Tank Standard Plate Count (BTSPC). The BTSPC determines the total number of bacteria in a milk sample that can grow and form countable colony forming units on a Standard Methods Agar plate when 1 ml of milk is incubated aerobically at 90°F for 48 hours. Ideally, raw milk should contain less than 5,000 bacteria/ml. A BTSPC of 10,000/ml or less is achievable by most farms if sanitation in the cows, the milking procedures and the milking equipment is good; and cooling is adequate. The maximum legal limit for BTSPC is 100,000/ml. The BTSPC is used by the Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals to determine the bacteria count in raw milk. Here are some things to check if the herd has a BTSPC above 10,000/ml.

1. Properly clean milking equipment after each milking and check to make sure equipment is properly sanitized before the next milking.
2. Wash water temperature should start at 155-170°F and drain at above 120°F.
3. Use the correct amount and type of detergent, acid or sanitizer. Using inexpensive alternatives designed for household uses are not recommended.
4. Gaskets, teat-cup liners, rubber parts and hoses need to be clean, free of cracks and deposits and replaced when needed.
5. Check for debris buildup in receiver jars, sanitary traps, plate coolers and chillers.
6. Keep your animals out of the mud! Muddy udders only add to the problems of high bacteria counts and high Bulk Tank Somatic Cell Count (BTSCC). Animals with excessive or long hair on their udders may need to be clipped or singed.

7. Proper udder sanitation procedures and limit water use to wash teats. Teats need to be clean, sanitized and dry before milking.
8. Check your bulk tank cooling system. Slow cooling bulk tanks or temperatures above 40°F dramatically contribute to the bacteria count in bulk tank milk. The bulk tank milk temperature should be less than 40°F within two hours of milking and kept below 45°F during milking.
9. Mastitis infections due to <u>*Streptococcus agalactiae*</u> can lead to a large number of these bacteria being released in the milk. Several cows infected with <u>*Strep. Ag.*</u> can cause the BTSPC to be elevated.

Another measure of milk quality is the Bulk Tank Preliminary Incubation Count (BTPIC). To determine BTPIC a sample of milk is incubated for 18 hours at 55°F followed by the BTSPC procedure. The BTPIC is based on the theory that normal microbial flora of the cow will not grow substantially when incubated at this combination of time and temperature. Other microorganisms present in milk due to poor sanitation, cooling and milking practices ***<u>CAN</u>*** grow to significant levels at these times and temperatures. These microorganisms are called psychrotrophic or cold-loving bacteria. Psychotrophic bacteria will continue to grow at temperatures below 45° F. These organisms and the enzymes they produce are associated with off-flavors, milk spoilage and short shelf-life. This has led some people to believe that BTPIC is the best measure of raw milk keeping quality and sanitation practices on farms. Currently there is no maximum allowable legal limit for BTPIC.

BTPIC below 50,000 is acceptable, but a goal of 25,000 or less should be achievable. Many farms can achieve a BTPIC of 10,000 or less just like the BTSPC if sanitation and milking procedures are monitored and maintained; and cooling equipment is functioning properly. Another approach for determining the quality of the milk and good practices on the farm is the BTPIC in relation to the BTSPC. If the BTPIC $\geq$ 3 times the BTSPC, then there is a potential problem. For example, if a milk sample has a BTSPC of 10,000 and a BTPIC of 11,000, then no substantial increase occurred and the BTPIC would imply cleaning, milking and cooling practices are not contributing significantly to the bacteria counts in the bulk tank milk. If the BTPIC had been 30,000 or greater, this would imply that procedures on the farm should be checked. Another example would be the sample has a BTSPC of 100,000 and a BTPIC of 115,000. Although the BTPIC count is greater than 100,000, it provides no additional information concerning potential sources of bacterial contamination. In this case a BTSPC of 100,000 would indicate a bacterial problem by organisms that grow poorly at 55°F within 18 hours.

The same check list that was used for trouble shooting elevated BTSPC can be used for BTPIC. Improperly sanitizing the milking system before each milking seems to be one of the major causes for a high BTPIC.

Another measure of milk quality is the Bulk Tank Coliform Count (BTCC). BTCC are associated with fecal and environmental contamination of the milk. Cows with coliform mastitis do not normally cause the BTCC to rise. BTCC in raw milk should be less than 50/ml and counts of 10/ml are achievable and desirable.

The table below indicates the probable sources of microbial contamination detected by the BTSPC and BTPIC procedures.

Procedure[1]	**Natural Flora**	**Mastitis**[2]	**Dirty Cows**	**Dirty Equip.**	**Poor Cooling**
BTSPC > 10,000	Not likely	Possible	Possible	Possible	Possible
BTSPC > 100,000	Not likely	Possible (rare)	Not likely	Possible*	Possible*
High BTPIC vs BTSPC	Not likely	Not likely	Possible	Possible*	Possible*
High BTSPC vs No Increase in BTPIC	Not likely	Possible	Possible but not likely	Possible but not likely	Possible but not likely
BTCC High	Not likely	Possible (rare)	Possible	Possible	Possible but not likely

[1]Table adapted from *Dairy Science Facts* – Cornell University 1998
[2]Culturing for mastitis causing bacteria and SCC data would be helpful
*A more likely possible cause

Constantly monitoring the milking procedures, equipment cleaning and milk cooling will go a long way in producing high quality milk that has low bacteria counts. However, monitoring these items will not have much of an impact on BTSCC. Bulk tank bacteria counts and BTSCC are not closely related (see next article by Donald Pritchard). The problems associated with high bulk tank bacteria counts may or may not have anything to do with BTSCC. High BTSCC is determined exclusively by high SCC in individual cows. Previous research has shown that high SCC in individual cows is caused primarily by bacterial infections in these cows. Reducing the number and severity of these intramammary infections ***<u>WILL</u>*** reduce SCC in individual cows and in BTSCC.

However, reducing the number and severity of these intramammary infections in individual cows usually has little impact on BT bacteria counts. Reducing BTSCC usually requires addressing other farm management practices that lead to increased numbers of intramammary infections and consequently high SCC in individual cows.

If you are having a bacteria problem, call your local county agent, your milk company or co-op field representative or the LSU Department of Dairy Science at 225-578-4411.

Monitoring Bulk Tank Milk Quality[1]

Donald E. Pritchard, Extension Dairy Specialist
North Carolina State University

A report in the October issue of the Journal of Dairy Science by an extension veterinary group at the Pennsylvania State University presented some interesting findings on the relationships between somatic cell counts and bacteria counts in bulk tank milk (BTM). Correlations between various laboratory methods used to measure bacteria counts in milk, as well as correlations between the various lab methods and somatic cell counts were used to measure the relationships between somatic cell counts and various bacteria counts in BTM..

BTM from 126 dairy herds ranging in size from < 50 to > 200 cows was sampled twice a month for two months. Bacterial count methods included standard plate count (BTSPC), preliminary incubation count (BTPIC), laboratory pasteurization count (BTLPC), coagulase-negative staphylococci (BTCNS) count, environmental streptococci (BTES) count, coliform count (BTCC), gram-negative non-coliform (BTNC) count and contagious mastitis pathogens (BTSA Staphylococcus aureus, BTSAG Streptococcus agalactiae, and BTMycoplasma). Somatic cell counts of all the bulk tank milk samples (BTSCC) were also measured. The effects of herd size and numerous management practices on somatic cell and bacterial counts were also examined. A brief summary of the findings is listed below.

- The paired correlation analyses between BTSCC and the different bacterial count methods listed above were all low (<0.37). This suggested BTSCC can't be estimated just by measuring bacterial counts from a bulk tank milk sample.
- Correlations from paired analyses between BTSPC and BTES, BTPIC, BTCNS, and BTLPC were strong (>0.5). This suggested fairly strong relationships between BTSPC and other measures of specific types of bacteria in milk.
- Correlations between various bacteria counts (BTCNS, BTES, BTCC, and BTNC) were low (<0.5). This suggested no relationships between the numbers of different types of bacteria in milk.
- The BTSPC and BTES counts were ***significantly lower*** in BTM when teats were dipped both pre- and post-milking.
- The BTSCC, SPC, and PIC counts in BTM were significantly ***higher*** when teat dip was applied as a spray compared to when a dip cup was used.
- None of the management practices examined had any significant effect on the BTLPC in BTM.
- The BTCNS counts were significantly lower in BTM milk when cows were milked using automatic milk detachers.
- BTSCC were lowest in herds with >100 cows.
- An increase in BTSPC was associated with unclean udders before milking, poor teat-end sanitation, improper cleaning and sanitation of milking equipment, and improper cooling of milk.
- Herds that used sand as bedding had significantly lower BTSCC compared with herds using organic bedding.
- Pre-and post milking teat dipping reduced the number of environmental mastitis pathogens (BTCNS, BTES), the number of thermoduric bacteria (measured by BTLPC), and the number of psychrotrophic bacteria (measured by BTPIC).
- The isolation rates in BTM of BTSA and BTSAG ***increased*** as the BTSCC values ***increased*** and also as the number of times the BTM was sampled and examined for bacteria content.

This study supports previous research showing the importance of sanitation and cleanliness in keeping BTSCC and BTM bacteria counts low. Paying more attention to practices promoting high quality milk ***WILL*** lower the BTSCC and BTM bacteria counts in your herd. For more information on practices which will lower your BTSCC and BTM bacteria counts, contact your county agent, your milk company or co-op field representative or the LSU Department of Dairy Science at 225-578-4411.

[1]Article was reprinted from the University of Tennessee Cooperative Extension Service, *Tennessee Dairy News*, volume 2 number 3 Fall 2004

February 2005 Sire Summary Information

Dr. Gary M. Hay, Dept. of Dairy Science
LSU AgCenter

The February 2005 USDA Sire Summary information is available on the web at *http://www.aipl.arsusda.gov/eval.htm*. The new sire summary values can be found under the heading ***Evaluations***. The new values for Net Merit$ and Fluid Merit$ for Holsteins are as follows:

Percentile Value	Net Merit$	Fluid Merit$*
90	394	386
80	339	327
70	291	296

* Fluid Merit$ is a more appropriate index selection value for herds in the southeast federal milk marketing order since it relies more on fluid milk prices than milk components.

The Effects of Early Lactation SCCs in Heifers

Dr. Donald E. Pritchard, Extension Dairy Specialist
North Carolina State University

Collaborative researchers from Belgium and Canada reported on various associations and impacts of high somatic cell counts (SCC) in first calf heifers in a series of papers recently published in the Journal of Dairy Science. The findings might give dairy producers insight as to how to better manage their heifers.

From the records of nearly 2,000 heifers in 159 Belgium herds, it was found that SCC between days 5 and 14 of lactation were associated with certain herd characteristics. Higher-producing herds, herds with an average first calving age of less than 27 months, and herds with lower bulk tank milk SCC scores were associated with heifers that had lower SCC at between days 5 and 14 of lactation. Cleanliness of the calving area was also associated with lower SCC scores. Heifers calving in cleaner areas (heifers that were on slatted floors) had lower SCC scores than heifers calving in more unclean types of areas (on non-slatted floors). These associations suggest that better managed herds have heifers calving with lower SCC scores.

The researchers further reported that the early lactation SCC of heifers had an impact on both the milk yield and also the SCC over the entire first lactation. As early lactation SCC increased, daily milk yield decreased throughout the lactation. Additionally, as early lactation SCC increased, DHIA test-day SCC throughout the remainder of the lactation also increased. Thus, it was concluded that the udder health of heifers in early lactation had a lasting impact throughout the lactation.

The association between level of culling of first lactation heifers and their early lactation SCC score was also studied. It was found that udder health problems were the culling reason for 10% of the culled heifers in the study. As the SCC score between days 5 and 14 of lactation increased, the culling level during the first lactation for udder health reasons also increased.

These findings may not be new information for many producers, based upon their experiences. However, I believe the results of the study give all producers further reason to pay closer attention to how they manage heifers and the factors that can affect the udder health of their heifers.

I encourage all dairy producers to review of the heifer management practices used in their herds. Contact your Extension agent, veterinarian, dairy plant/handler fieldman, or other competent consultant and ask for a review of your heifer management practices. Reducing the level of udder infections in heifers at time of calving can have a significant positive impact on the profitability of a dairy operation. The results are worth the time and effort.

Dairy Dates

March 31	Southeast Research Station Field Day	Southeast Research Station	Franklinton	9:00 am
April 2	Dixieland Holstein Sale	Washington Parish Fairgrounds	Franklinton	11:00 am
April 2	Southeast Louisiana Dairy Show	Washington Parish Fairgrounds	Franklinton	4:00 pm

TOP HERDS BY WEIGHTED AVERAGE TEST DAY SCC (ALL COWS)

NAME	DATE	BR	COWS	DIM	SCC	ECM	MILK	FAT	PRO	RHA
LEESFIELD DAIRY FARM	12/28	H	85	187	152	45.9	48.1	3.3	3.0	16587
LSU DAIRY	1/28	H	73	199	156	69.3	67.2	3.8	3.2	19815
ROBERT HUTCHINSON JR	1/18	H	99	172	166	.	41.2	.	.	13070
DUSTY SCHILLING	1/25	H	100	151	167	53.0	56.2	3.2	3.0	17852
BOBBY BROWN	1/13	H	40	157	184	45.0	47.7	3.2	3.1	16349
HILL FARM RESEARCH STATION	1/11	J	56	73	188	48.5	51.0	3.1	3.4	15907
USL DAIRY	1/18	X	28	98	199	41.3	48.5	2.7	2.7	10981
ROBERT POTTS	1/19	H	155	182	247	50.5	53.0	3.2	3.1	16253
BRENT & LAURIE DUNCAN	1/27	H	264	130	256	57.9	57.6	3.6	3.2	15979
CLINTON STEVENS	1/5	H	124	180	260	37.3	38.5	3.5	2.9	15855
RAYMOND SCHMIDT	1/6	H	81	188	268	45.6	48.1	3.2	3.1	16946
NED SIMMONS	1/12	H	163	187	270	39.7	35.2	4.4	3.4	14101
UDDER FRESH	1/17	H	106	194	293	49.4	49.0	3.5	3.4	18024
TO-BEV FARMS	1/17	H	162	166	297	50.1	53.0	3.3	2.9	17861
JACKSON BRUMFIELD	12/30	H	59	96	306	.	41.2	.	.	11162
CIRCLE G FARMS	1/14	H	177	149	307	48.6	49.8	3.4	3.0	18094
J PAUL ALFORD	1/3	H	104	183	311	54.5	52.5	3.9	3.0	20104
EUGENE ROBERTSON	1/10	H	176	193	326	53.0	53.9	3.3	3.4	19260
C JOHNSON & W LITWILLER	1/27	H	106	172	329	63.9	66.4	3.1	3.4	20518
SE LA EXP STATION	1/13	H	223	157	329	64.6	64.5	3.6	3.1	21804
MARLYNN FARM'S	1/25	X	122	185	340	40.0	40.5	3.3	3.4	14254
GEORGE HYDE	1/17	H	104	122	340	.	62.9	.	.	16626
LOUISIANA TECH DAIRY	1/4	J	38	134	347	47.6	43.2	4.3	3.3	14293
LADD BLADES	1/19	H	221	139	349	59.6	60.9	3.5	3.0	19013
J W DOC SCHILLING	1/21	H	120	167	354	45.5	44.8	3.4	3.6	18136

TOP HERDS BY WEIGHTED AVERAGE TEST DAY SCC (ALL COWS)

NAME	DATE	BR	COWS	DIM	SCC	ECM	MILK	FAT	PRO	RHA
LSU DAIRY	2/24	H	79	165	156	67.7	69.5	3.5	2.9	20195
LANNY CONERLY	2/7	H	55	151	168	42.8	41.7	3.8	3.1	12673
PHILLIP ROBERTS	2/8	X	146	123	179	39.2	37.1	3.9	3.5	14437
J PAUL ALFORD	2/7	H	104	162	236	62.3	62.8	3.5	3.1	19884
CIRCLE G FARMS	2/14	H	173	150	238	61.9	64.1	3.3	3.1	18049
IVERY REED	2/3	H	64	200	240	42.3	44.8	3.2	3.0	13400
ROBERT HUTCHINSON JR	2/17	H	98	182	248	.	42.5	.	.	13169
JACKSON BRUMFIELD	2/23	H	63	121	261	.	46.0	.	.	11905
UDDER FRESH	2/16	H	106	198	263	51.4	55.0	2.9	3.3	18098
PHILLIP ROBERTS	2/8	H	159	157	266	45.8	45.3	3.6	3.3	16031
JEFF & MARY ADDISON	2/14	J	67	140	273	35.9	32.8	4.2	3.4	12016
CLINTON STEVENS	2/2	H	124	185	275	47.1	44.6	4.1	3.0	15642
CLIFFORD CHAMPLIN	2/21	H	204	95	292	73.4	73.4	3.6	3.0	20397
RUSSELL AND RUSTY CREEL	2/10	H	74	216	310	49.9	51.9	3.3	3.1	17633
HILL FARM RESEARCH STATION	2/3	J	68	200	314	34.2	30.9	4.2	3.6	13246
MAYFIELD'S DAIRY	2/15	H	63	89	321	50.8	53.9	3.3	2.9	15367
FARMER'S DAIRY	2/10	H	47	193	331	56.4	57.8	3.5	2.9	18648
ROBERT POTTS	2/21	H	149	192	334	52.1	52.1	3.6	3.1	16289
TO-BEV FARMS	2/21	H	162	192	336	47.4	52.0	3.1	2.8	17811
SE LA EXP STATION	2/14	H	224	167	340	67.2	68.7	3.5	2.9	21600
ROYCE SALLEY	2/21	X	267	127	343	36.2	44.0	2.3	2.9	13248
JAMES ROGERS	2/9	H	88	209	343	.	39.1	.	.	12411
GEORGE HYDE	2/13	H	104	138	352	.	62.2	.	.	16627
M & B DAIRY FARM INC.	2/9	H	160	147	354	52.6	53.0	3.7	2.8	15571
LANNY CONERLY	2/7	H	198	143	356	41.8	41.3	3.7	3.1	13853
BOBBY GOINGS	2/10	H	113	191	361	49.0	47.8	3.7	3.2	16974

TOP HERDS BY AVERAGE TEST DAY ENERGY CORRECTED MILK (ALL COWS)

NAME	DATE	BR	COWS	DIM	ECM	MILK	FAT	PRO	RHA
LSU DAIRY	1/28	H	73	199	69.3	67.2	3.8	3.2	19815
CLIFFORD CHAMPLIN	1/3	H	227	81	65.0	65.0	3.6	3.0	20004
SE LA EXP STATION	1/13	H	223	157	64.6	64.5	3.6	3.1	21804
C JOHNSON & W LITWILLER	1/27	H	106	172	63.9	66.4	3.1	3.4	20518
GALEN NIGHTINGALE	1/27	H	72	170	62.3	68.0	2.9	3.1	19577
HOLLIS BANKSTON & SONS	1/25	H	100	138	61.1	56.3	3.9	3.7	16426
KIRBY VARNADO	1/25	H	97	157	60.4	58.0	3.6	3.6	21067
BILLY ANDREWS	1/6	H	91	135	60.4	60.6	3.6	2.9	18337
LADD BLADES	1/19	H	221	139	59.6	60.9	3.5	3.0	19013
BRENT & LAURIE DUNCAN	1/27	H	264	130	57.9	57.6	3.6	3.2	15979
MARVIN FLETCHER	1/12	H	163	187	57.6	57.0	3.7	3.0	19225
BROWN DAIRY FARM	1/19	H	172	134	57.3	61.5	3.0	3.1	16110
J PAUL ALFORD	1/3	H	104	183	54.5	52.5	3.9	3.0	20104
LOUISIANA TECH DAIRY	1/4	H	49	132	54.0	57.2	3.4	2.7	19278
DARON MILEY	1/25	H	105	198	53.5	50.3	3.9	3.5	16740
DUSTY SCHILLING	1/25	H	100	151	53.0	56.2	3.2	3.0	17852
EUGENE ROBERTSON	1/10	H	176	193	53.0	53.9	3.3	3.4	19260
FARMER'S DAIRY	1/5	H	46	171	51.9	55.5	3.2	2.8	18524
MAYFIELD'S DAIRY	1/16	H	42	95	51.1	50.1	3.8	3.0	14827
ROBERT POTTS	1/19	H	155	182	50.5	53.0	3.2	3.1	16253
FRANCIS HOLMES	1/24	H	67	172	50.2	49.3	3.9	2.9	16104
TO-BEV FARMS	1/17	H	162	166	50.1	53.0	3.3	2.9	17861
UDDER FRESH	1/17	H	106	194	49.4	49.0	3.5	3.4	18024
CIRCLE G FARMS	1/14	H	177	149	48.6	49.8	3.4	3.0	18094
HILL FARM RESEARCH STATION	1/11	J	56	73	48.5	51.0	3.1	3.4	15907

TOP HERDS BY AVERAGE TEST DAY ENERGY CORRECTED MILK (ALL COWS)

NAME	DATE	BR	COWS	DIM	ECM	MILK	FAT	PRO	RHA
CLIFFORD CHAMPLIN	2/21	H	204	95	73.4	73.4	3.6	3.0	20397
BILLY ANDREWS	2/3	H	99	129	69.9	70.9	3.6	2.9	18380
LSU DAIRY	2/24	H	79	165	67.7	69.5	3.5	2.9	20195
SE LA EXP STATION	2/14	H	224	167	67.2	68.7	3.5	2.9	21600
J PAUL ALFORD	2/7	H	104	162	62.3	62.8	3.5	3.1	19884
JOHN FAUNCE JR DAIRY	2/1	H	232	166	62.0	61.1	3.6	3.2	18295
CIRCLE G FARMS	2/14	H	173	150	61.9	64.1	3.3	3.1	18049
LEESFIELD DAIRY FARM	2/1	H	85	186	60.3	59.3	3.7	3.1	16772
RUSSELL AND RUSTY CREEL	2/10	H	29	180	57.0	59.4	3.2	3.2	16877
FARMER'S DAIRY	2/10	H	47	193	56.4	57.8	3.5	2.9	18648
MARK WASKOM	1/30	H	88	163	56.4	56.6	3.5	3.1	16372
KARIE AND BRAD BLADES	2/16	H	179	272	55.0	54.8	3.5	3.3	18015
RAYMOND SCHMIDT	2/11	H	80	188	54.8	57.4	3.3	2.9	17134
HOLLIS BANKSTON & SONS	2/23	H	104	151	54.7	55.0	3.5	3.1	16629
M & B DAIRY FARM INC.	2/9	H	160	147	52.6	53.0	3.7	2.8	15571
RODNEY HOLDEN	2/5	H	82	202	52.6	49.6	4.1	3.1	15374
ROBERT POTTS	2/21	H	149	192	52.1	52.1	3.6	3.1	16289
O B MITCHELL	2/7	X	52	198	51.7	47.6	4.2	3.2	17228
UDDER FRESH	2/16	H	106	198	51.4	55.0	2.9	3.3	18098
MAYFIELD'S DAIRY	2/15	H	63	89	50.8	53.9	3.3	2.9	15367
RUSSELL AND RUSTY CREEL	2/10	H	74	216	49.9	51.9	3.3	3.1	17633
HILL FARM RESEARCH STATION	2/3	J	63	99	49.8	50.1	3.4	3.3	15804
BOBBY GOINGS	2/10	H	113	191	49.0	47.8	3.7	3.2	16974
TO-BEV FARMS	2/21	H	162	192	47.4	52.0	3.1	2.8	17811
VICTOR WOMACK	2/25	H	110	154	47.3	48.4	3.4	3.1	15610

Dairy Science Department
Dairy Science Building
LSU AgCenter
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

LSU AgCenter
Research & Extension

Louisiana Dairy Digest

Your Herd Management Resource

Dairy Science Department
Dairy Science Building
LSU AgCenter
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
(225)578-4411
Fax: (225)578-4008
Website: www.lsuagcenter.com

EXTENSION PROGRAMS
Agriculture and Forestry
Community Leadership
Economic Development
Environmental Sciences
Family and Consumer Sciences
4-H Youth Development
Natural Resources

Contact your county agent for more information on any dairy herd management topic.

____
Dairy Specialist