New York Simmental Assn.   New York Simmental Assn.   Newsletter   VOL 3   VOL 3   NYSA@NewYorkSimmental.com   607-423-4888						
COMING EVENTS & DEADLINES	INDEX					
Aug. 6 - 8 - Empire Farm Days	Pg.2 - Juniors Out and About					
Aug. 21 - Sept 2 - NYS Fair	Pg,3 - Fall Festival Info. Pg. 5-7 - Late Calving Cows					
Aug. 27 - Beef Day -NYS Fair	Pg.8-9 - ASA CMP Results Pg.11 - Big 4 Parasites					
Sept. 1 - Simmental Show	Pg. 13-16 – Corral Work Pg. 18-19 – 1 Shot Sync.					
Oct. 11 - 13 NYJBPA Fall Festival	Pg.20-21 - Underfeeding Cows Pg. 23 - Directory Page					

NYS Fair Simmental Show Sunday, September 1 12:00 noon



Next Simmental Meeting September 2, 2019 NYS Fair Beef Barn Pavillion Around 11:00 am.

# JUNIORS OUT AND ABOUT





Elsie Donlick with Simme Valley Glamour, 2-2-19 Supreme Champion, Cortland Co. Sire: Pays to Believe

Kylee Wiggins with Champion Crossbred Heifer, Farmers Museum Junior Livestock Show in Cooperstown, NY



Annika Donlick with Simme Valley Firecracker, 2-25-18 Res Supreme Champion Cortland County – Sire: Mack AF



Bailey Wood with Feeder Steer Champion Farmers Museum Junior Livestock Show in Cooperstown, NY



# 2018 NYJBPA Fall Festival October 11-13, 2019



Dear Junior Beef Exhibitor:

The NYJBPA Fall Festival will hold its 24th Annual Heifer/Steer Show, scheduled for October 11-13, 2019, in conjunction with SUNY Cobleskill's AAPC Coby Classic Jackpot Show. <u>\*\*PLEASE NOTE:</u> <u>The NYJBPA show and the AAPC show have **SEPARATE** entry forms – to compete in both shows, you will need to mail them in to their respective entry coordinators.</u> This year's show will again be held at the Schoharie County Sunshine Fairgrounds in Cobleskill, NY, and is open to any youth age 21 and under as of January 1, 2019.

It is mandatory that all junior exhibitors participate in Showmanship classes. Showmanship is **NO-FIT** 

The Heifer/Steer Show will be held on Sunday, October 13, immediately following the team fitting competition and awards (~9:30<sub>AM</sub>). Heifer classes will be split by age as described on the entry form. Steer classes will be divided by weight—steers will be weighed Saturday at 8:00<sub>AM</sub>.

All entries and payment MUST BE postmarked by September 24. The entry fee is \$15 per head. Late entries and payment MUST BE postmarked by October 1 and will incur an additional fee of \$10 per head (totaling \$25 per head). No entries will be accepted after this date.

All junior exhibitors and challenge participants must be members of the NYJBPA. **Memberships are valid from January-December of the current year.** Memberships are \$10/individual or \$25/family—if you are not already a member, you may purchase a membership on the entry form.

**Health papers are required**—consult a NYS veterinarian for current health requirements for cattle exhibited at NYS fairs. **Registration papers are required with the exception of commercial cattle.** Exhibitors must currently own or lease the animal that they are showing. Proper registration papers or lease agreement (if applicable) should be presented at check-in.

# Please find your entry forms and updated information at: NYBPA.org - Junior Association

\*\*Premium money is paid out for both junior shows and for all challenge events. If each exhibitor could solicit a minimum of two donations to help with the prizes, it would be greatly appreciated. Send donations to Julie Murphy (checks made payable to NYBPA) along with the full name and address of the sponsor.\*\*

# 2018 NYJBPA Fall Festival – Heifer/Steer Show and Challenge Events

Show Dates: Entry Deadline and Fee: Late Entry Deadline and Fee: Cattle Arrival: Check-In: \*\*<u>IMPORTANT NOTE</u>: This is a YOUTH event primarily for youth members under the age of 21. Anyone consuming alcoholic beverages during this event may be asked to leave the premises and will risk losing premium award money for themselves and/or their family.



# Moving Late Calving Cows Up in the Breeding Season

UNIVERSITY of NEBRASKA–LINCOLN By Bethany Johnston & Jay Jenkins, NE Extension Beef Educators

As the end of the calving season nears for many cattlemen, the last few cows in the heavy pen seem to last forever. Those late calvers are doing more than dragging out the calving season. They are costing you money. Their young calves are usually lighter at weaning, late calving cows usually rebreed later or not at all.

How can you move up a late calving cow in the breeding season? The answer is a CIDR. CIDR stands for Controlled Intravaginal Drug Release device. It is inserted into the cow's vagina, where it releases the hormone progesterone. CIDRs are a common estrus synchronization tool, but they can also be used to bring cows into heat before she would normally come into heat on her own.

In order for this to work, you should insert the CIDR no sooner than 20 days after calving. The uterus must shrink back to its original size for reproduction



to occur. Recovery takes time-imagine something holding a 90 pound calf needing to shrink to the size of a volleyball. Trying to "jump start" the cycle with a CIDR (progesterone device) too early after calving could result in less than desired pregnancy results.

If you plan to use natural service breeding insert a CIDR for 7 days, then remove the CIDR on day 7, and give an injection of prostaglandin. Bulls can be immediately be placed with the cows. There is no need for extra bulls, a bull to cow ratio of 1:25 should be sufficient. However, all bulls should have a breeding soundness exam by a veterinarian. Young bulls may require special attention and a higher bull to cow ratio.

This protocol requires two cattle handlings and will cost around \$15 for the CIDR and prostaglandin.

Since the CIDR will synchronize estrus you could also use artificial insemination (A.I.). If you choose to A.I. you need to add a GnRH injection at the CIDR insertion, leave the CIDR in for 7 days, and inject prostaglandin when you remove the CIDR.

If you plan to A.I. it would be worth your time to look over the different estrus synchronization protocols at: http://beefrepro.info or visit with your A.I. representative or Extension Educator. Choose a system that works best for you. Any of the 7-day CIDR protocols will "jump start" the estrus cycle. The "recipe" for each system should be followed exactly- no guessing or giving late injections!

Cows should be in good condition, a body condition score of 5 or greater at the time of calving, and maintaining or gaining weight after calving through breeding. Cows maintaining or gaining weight are

more likely to conceive and sustain a pregnancy than cows losing weight.

It will cost a little money and take some extra work, but it is possible to move those late calving cows up.



# Comparing MGA vs. CIDR for Estrus Synchrony in Beef Heifers

When evaluating whether to use an MGA or CIDR estrus synchronization protocol, the advantages and disadvantages of each should be considered. Rebecca A. Vraspir, Adam F. Summers, Doug O'Hare, Larry D. Rowden, and Rick N. Funston. Summarized by Aaron Berger, Nebraska Extension Educator



Progestin - based estrus synchronization protocols that utilize melengestrol acetate (MGA) or controlled

internal drug release (CIDR) devices can be effectively used for synchronizing estrus in heifers. A study conducted by the University of Nebraska – Lincoln compared these two protocols to one another utilizing artificial insemination (AI) along with natural service.

The study involved 1385 yearling heifers. The heifers were randomly assigned to one of two treatments shown in Figure 1 http://go.unl.edu/m3oy (From the 2014 Nebraska Beef Cattle Report "Comparison of Long-term Progestin-Based Synchronization Protocols on Fixed-time AI Pregnancy Rate in Beef Heifers").

Both groups of heifers were initially bred using a fixed time artificial insemination (FTAI) protocol by 10 AI technicians. Semen from a single bull was used to reduce variation in pregnancy rates due to semen quality. Fixed- time pregnancy rates, natural service pregnancy rates and final pregnancy rates were not signicantly different between the two treatments (See Table 2 http://go.unl.edu/kvrr, from the 2014 Nebraska Beef Cattle Report "Comparison of Long-term Progestin-Based Synchronization Protocols on Fixed-time AI Pregnancy Rate in Beef Heifers").

### SUMMARY

1. The use of an MGA or CIDR estrus synchronization protocol was equally effective when used in a fixed time artificial insemination program.

2. There was no significant difference in natural service (AI clean up) pregnancy rates between the two treatments.

3. Overall final pregnancy rates were not statistically different between the two treatments.

4. An economic analysis showed that the MGA treatment protocol cost approximately \$19 less to produce a pregnant heifer than the 14-day CIDR protocol, primarily due to cost differences between the treatments.

When evaluating whether to use an MGA or CIDR estrus synchronization protocol, the advantages and disadvantages of each should be considered.

The following are **advantages** and **disadvantages** of using **MGA** for estrus synchrony as compared to the CIDR protocol:

• MGA must be consumed consistently every day over a 14 day period to be effective. This can be easily accomplished when heifers are being fed a complete ration daily. It is harder when heifers are gazing out and are being fed a supplement containing the MGA.

• MGA requires daily labor for the delivery of the product.

• MGA takes two less trips through the chute than the CIDR protocol.

• MGA costs less for the progestin product per head than a CIDR does.

The following are **advantages** and **disadvantages** of using a **CIDR** for estrus synchrony as compared to the MGA protocol:

• CIDRs can be placed in the heifers and it is known that the heifers are getting the progestin dose needed without daily feeding. This can be an advantage when heifers are grazing and do not need to be fed on a daily basis.

 The daily labor needed for delivery of the progestin in the CIDR protocol is less than when utilizing MGA. Labor is concentrated on the days when the CIDR is placed and removed.

• The CIDR protocol requires two more trips through the chute than the MGA protocol.

• The cost per head is more for the progestin product using a CIDR than it is for MGA.



Producers planning to utilize estrus synchronization and artificially inseminate heifers this spring, should evaluate which of these two estrus synchronization protocols best fit their resources and management. For more information on this study, please see the 2014 Nebraska Beef Cattle Report "Comparison of Long-term Progestin-Based Synchronization Protocols on Fixed time AI Pregnancy Rate in Beef Heifers." (http://go.unl.edu/574h). For more information on recommended estrus synchronization protocols visit the Resources page at the Applied Reproductive Strategies in Beef Cattle (http://beefrepro.unl.edu/resources.html) website.

To listen to BeefWatch podcasts go to: https://itunes.apple.com/us/podcast/unl-beefwatch/id964198047 or paste http://feeds.feedburner.com/unlbeefwatch into your podcast app.

	T	reatment		
Item	MGA <sup>1</sup>	14-day CIDR <sup>2</sup>	SEM	P-value
n	688	697		
Significant structure, <sup>3</sup> %	99	97	1	0.08
Pelvic area, cm <sup>2</sup>	159	157	1	0.50
Fixed-time AI pregnancy rate, <sup>4</sup> %	62	61	2	0.56
Heifers receiving second AI, %	26	26	2	0.83
Second AI pregnancy rate, <sup>5</sup> %	66	56	4	0.06
Natural service pregnancy rate, <sup>6</sup> %	66	65	4	0.85
Final pregnancy rate, <sup>6</sup> %	93	90	1	0.27

Table 2. Reproductive measurements prior to treatment and effect of controlled internal drug

<sup>1</sup>Received MGA day 0 to 13, followed by PGF<sub>2a</sub> day 32, GnRH was administered at fixed time-AI, approximately 72 hours after  $PGF_{2\alpha}$  (day 35).

<sup>2</sup>Received CIDR day 2 to 16, followed by PGF<sub>20</sub> day 32, GnRH was administered at fixed time-AI, approximately 66 hours after  $PGF_{2\alpha}$  (day 35).

<sup>3</sup>Presence of a palpable follicle and/or corpus luteum.

<sup>4</sup>Determined via transrectal ultrasound 45 days following FTAL.

<sup>5</sup>Determined via transrectal ultrasound approximately 50 days following second AI.

<sup>6</sup>Determined via transrectal ultrasound 36 days following bull removal.

# CMP Bull Class of 2016 Results CMP 2017 - born Carcass Merit Program (CMP) - sired calves provide valuable insight to the ASA genetic evaluation.

CARCASS MERIT PROGRAM

#### By Lane Giess, Director of Commercial & Nontraditional Data Programs

Seedstock and commercial cattlemen have a vested interest in improving the end-product merit of cattle they produce. As progressively more cattle operations rely on grid-based revenue programs through retained ownership, the need for more accurate estimations of carcass merit becomes paramount. Research projects and data submission efforts are underway to address these needs. One of these, the American Simmental Association Carcass Merit Program (CMP), is a structured young sire progeny test where breeders nominate bulls of their choosing to be sampled across a diverse group of commercial cattle operations. Calves from these matings are harvested and individual carcass records provided. Started in the 1990s, the CMP continues to see success and growth among membership and commercial clients.

Included are the results from the CMP Bull Class of 2016. A total of 28 bulls were sampled in three partner herds across the country. In total, 745 calves were born in 2017 from CMP-sired matings, with 397 carcass records submitted. Harvest plant data reported 84% of the calves graded USDA Choice or higher with an average score of Small 97. The average 12th ribeye size was 14.54 square inches with an average carcass weight of 840.4 pounds.



As one of the most demanding and informative young sire tests in the industry, the CMP requires comprehensive data collection from partner herds in the form of recording birth weights, calving ease, weaning weights, and yearling weights on every calf born. Feed intake records are also gathered on a large portion of CMP calves. All matings are randomized and multiple test sires are used in each partner herd to ensure proper statistical design. A notable addition in recent years is the integration of genomic testing; all CMP-sired terminal calves receive a low density test and all nominated bulls receive a research F250K test.

Name	ASA	# of Progeny	# of Carcass Records	# of Progeny genomically Tested
CCR PREMIUM REVENUE	2703755	30	22	24
GW WOLFPACK 712A *	2708199	20	9	10
HOOKS ACHILLES 5A	2716166	34	25	27
CCR SANTA FE 9349Z *	2720494	19	10	10
GIBBS 2698Z BIG JOHN **	2722999	12	6	9
CLRS AFTER SHOCK 604 A **	2735656	21	10	10
ELLIOTT A100 *	2751321	7	3	4
JBS MR FORCE 107A	2770705	27	13	16
GTWY AUTHORITY 302A	2789756	30	21	21
IR DUNDEE A732	2810666	22	11	13
HOOK'S BEACON 56B **	2854180	9	4	4
RLWF PROPHET MARGIN 1393	2889313	27	13	16
TRPH RRR NIGHTFORCE B30	2899305	40	17	19
MCDF BRIGADIER 487B	2910249	14	11	11
MCDF NEW RIVER 499B	2910283	29	13	14
BAR CK PEERLESS 4080B	2912192	37	10	14
BAR CK NO EQUAL 4118B	2912227	32	13	13
BAR CK VALEDICTORIAN	2912275	35	23	23
GW TRIPLE CROWN 018C **	2954741	27	9	9
GIBBS 4091B THE ROCK	2968152	35	16	15
LRS ICONIC 303C	2969665	36	24	29
JC ENGINEER 102C **	2976529	20	5	5
NLC COW BOSS 160C	2978190	37	22	24
REDHILL MUSKOKA 71C	3009940	21	11	12
TJ DARKHORSE 452C **	3022434	28	16	17
TJ FIRST CUT 1109C	3022818	30	23	23
CCR ABILENE 6018C	3026655	26	14	14
TNT REVENANT C217	3044009	38	23	29
* Used in previous CMP years ** Used in following CMP years				

The usefulness of genomic testing on animals with actual carcass and feed intake phenotypes is incredibly informative in developing genomic knowledge of carcass traits and dry matter intake. This will allow the genomic tests to better predict these valuable and hardto-collect traits on any future animal with a genomic test. A total of 435 low-density genomic panels were run on CMP-sired calves.

The CMP will continue to add valuable and relevant progeny testing data to the industry's top young herd sire prospects. Anyone interested in participating can learn more at www.simmental.org.

CMP sired calves on feed at Chappell Feedyards, Chappell, NE. Photo taken by Hannah Wine

# **2016 CMP Bulls**

#### Following is a list of 2016 Carcass Merit Program (CMP) bulls, with 2017 born calves.

Name	ASA	DOB	Breeds	CE	Stay	CW	YG	Mrb	BF	REA	Shr	\$API	\$TI
CCR PREMIUM REVENUE	2703755	9/3/11	1/2 SM 1/2 AN	9.6 0.56	15.4 0.3	44.5 0.56	-0.03 0.45	0.37 0.53	0.001 0.48	0.56 0.56	-0.44 0.17	121.7	67.3
GW WOLFPACK 712A *	2708199	2/6/13	5/8 SM 3/8 AN	8.1 0.68	20 0.4	17.7 0.7	-0.37 0.53	0.58 0.68	-0.076 0.56	0.66 0.69	-0.37 0.18	150.4	80.3
HOOKS ACHILLES 5A	2716166	2/16/13	1/2 SM 1/2 AN	9.1 0.67	19.5 0.33	47.5 0.67	-0.22 0.49	0.43 0.58	-0.032 0.49	0.93 0.63	-0.31 0.17	141.3	76.9
CCR SANTA FE 9349Z *	2720494	9/4/12	3/4 SM 1/4 AN	8.9 0.77	15.8 0.41	33.2 0.72	-0.3 0.55	-0.06 0.68	-0.049 0.59	0.88 0.71	-0.44 0.17	118.1	72.1
GIBBS 2698Z BIG JOHN **	2722999	9/13/12	PB SM	9.3 0.56	17.1 0.31	46.2 0.55	-0.45 0.42	0.12 0.44	-0.1 0.4	1.11 0.53	-0.37 0.17	128.8	73.4
CLRS AFTER SHOCK 604 A **	2735656	3/20/13	PB SM	13 0. <i>7</i> 4	19.4 0.37	39.4 0.67	-0.32 0.52	0.04 0.64	-0.091 0.56	0.66 0.65	-0.42 0.17	139.2	79.4
ELLIOTT A100 *	2751321	2/24/13	PB SM	17.6 0.62	17.2 0.36	29.9 0.6	-0.61 0.46	0.13 0.54	-0.109 0.47	1.3 0.58	-0.4 0.17	141.8	72.5
JBS MR FORCE 107A	2770705	2/15/13	PB SM	12.1 0.67	20.7 0.37	35.1 0.65	-0.53 0.49	0.22 0.57	-0.083 0.52	1.34 0.61	-0.48 0.22	146.3	78.7
GTWY AUTHORITY 302A	2789756	2/9/13	1/2 SM 1/2 AN	7.8 0.56	17.4 0.28	21.5 0.54	-0.27 0.42	0.34 0.53	-0.036 0.45	0.73 0.52	-0.39 0.17	124.6	68.6
IR DUNDEE A732	2810666	8/25/13	3/4 SM 1/4 AN	10.6 0.56	19.1 0.26	37.1 0.57	-0.24 0.43	0.45 0.54	-0.042 0.44	0.78 0.54		141.8	76
HOOK'S BEACON 56B **	2854180	2/17/14	PB SM	17.2 0.82	21.1 0.4	21 0.73	-0.56 0.51	0.6 0.69	-0.057 0.51	1.45 0.64	-0.46 0.2	183.8	95.3
RLWF PROPHET MARGIN 1393	2889313	8/21/14	3/8 SM 5/8 AN	19.4 0.6	15.7 0.27	34.6 0.59	0.17 0.46	0.88 0.56	0.043 0.51	0.15 0.56		166	82.7
TRPH RRR NIGHTFORCE B30	2899305	2/27/14	3/4 SM 1/4 AN	15 0.62	19.2 0.3	21.1 0.63	-0.4 0.49	0.9 0.58	-0.061 0.53	0.91 0.59	-0.53 0.18	185.5	94.4
MCDF BRIGADIER 487B	2910249	3/6/14	PB SM	2.7 0.56	18.4 0.32	53.1 0.58	-0.47 0.45	0.2 0.57	-0.117 0.47	1.11 0.56	-0.4 0.17	126.3	78.3
MCDF NEW RIVER 499B	2910283	3/26/14	1/2 SM 1/2 AN	22.5 0.56	18 0.21	40.2 0.59	-0.28 0.46	0.27 0.54	-0.069 0.49	0.75 0.57	-0.33 0.17	1 <i>5</i> 0.7	73.7
BAR CK PEERLESS 4080B	2912192	9/21/14	1/2 SM 1/2 AN	9.5 0.57	11.2 0.21	44.7 0.55	-0.12 0.43	0.77 0.52	-0.03 0.45	0.59 0.54	-0.44 0.17	139.8	83.1
BAR CK NO EQUAL 4118B	2912227	10/3/14	1/2 SM 1/2 AN	21.9 0.65	19.8 0.27	15.4 0.6	-0.07 0.46	0.88 0.57	-0.013 0.5	0.19 0.57		184.8	86.2
BAR CK VALEDICTORIAN	2912275	10/22/14	1/2 SM 1/2 AN	19.7 0.56	12.7 0.26	41.7 0.53	-0.23 0.42	0.87 0.52	-0.003 0.43	1.11 0.51	-0.49 0.17	167.5	88.6
GW TRIPLE CROWN 018C **	2954741	2/12/15	5/8 SM 3/8 AN	14.3 0.66	18.5 0.3	43.8 0.66	-0.29 0.51	0.8 0.62	-0.059 0.55	0.89 0.63	-0.44 0.2	173.8	92
GIBBS 4091B THE ROCK	2968152	9/5/14	5/8 SM 3/8 AN	13.7 0.57	13.9 0.28	45.4 0.6	-0.37 0.45	0.17 0.53	-0.068 0.48	1.09 0.55	-0.64 0.21	125.4	73.3
LRS ICONIC 303C	2969665	2/25/15	1/2 SM 1/2 AN	17 0.6	16.7 0.26	42.3 0.6	-0.16 0.46	0.73 0.56	-0.017 0.5	0.79 0.55	-0.16 0.18	168.1	92
JC ENGINEER 102C **	2976529	2/20/15	PB SM	17.8 0.64	19.5 0.29	33 0.62	-0.38 0.47	0.19 0.56	-0.077 0.49	0.9 0.58	-0.54 0.19	155.2	78.5
NLC COW BOSS 160C	2978190	4/19/15	5/8 SM 3/8 AN	16.1 0.62	20.3 0.27	13.3 0.6	-0.19 0.45	0.39 0.57	-0.018 0.5	0.52 0.53	-0.43 0.18	150.9	78.4
REDHILL MUSKOKA 71C	3009940	1/22/153,	/4 SM 1/8 AN 1/8 HP	13.2 0.54	17.7 0.3	34 0.54	-0.38 0.41	0.42 0.49	-0.078 0.39	0.9 0.52	-0.34 0.18	143	79.5
TJ DARKHORSE 452C **	3022434	1/2/15	1/2 SM 1/2 AN	17.8 0.64	21 0.25	20.3 0.57	-0.07 0.43	0.27 0.52	0.004 0.41	0.42 0.54	-0.29 0.18	149.2	72.1
TJ FIRST CUT 1109C	3022818	2/8/15	1/2 SM 1/2 AN	15.7 0.57	18.3 0.26	44.1 0.57	0.03 0.45	0.71 0.57	0.027 0.49	0.59 0.56	-0.66 0.38	162	89.3
CCR ABILENE 6018C	3026655	1/27/15	3/4 SM 1/4 AN	10.4 0.6	13 0.28	39.9 0.62	-0.33 0.48	0.54 0.61	-0.058 0.51	0.96 0.59	-0.38 0.2	136.9	84.6
TNT REVENANT C217	3044009	3/9/15	1/2 SM 1/2 AN	22.4 0.63	17.1 0.26	14.3 0.6	-0.13 0.44	0.68 0.56	-0.021 0.44	0.31 0.54	-0.29 0.18	168.5	81.2

\* Used in previous CMP year

\*\* Used in following CMP year

# Elm Side Farm **Registered Simmental Cattle**



# **THE REYNOLDS** FAMILY

Art Reynolds, **Barb, Roger and Darby** 836 Little Dryden Rd Walton, N.Y. 13856 Barn: 607-865-6888 Cell: 607-434-3058

**Show Calves and Breeding Stock for Sale** Cattle for the small Breeder, calm dispositions. Visitors are always welcome - Call for directions



# **Dealing with the Big 4 Parasites**



# Worms, flies, ticks and lice are all costly to beef producers BY WYATT BECHTEL

Parasite control isn't a once-a-year thought to contemplate prior to

spring grazing. It is constant management consideration throughout the year with diff erent parasites popping up depending on weather and location.

For cattle producers there are four major parasites to contend with during the year: lice, worms, ticks and flies. Here are some management tips to keep in mind when considering parasite control programs:

# FLIES

Horn fl ies are going to be around for producers every year and compounding the problem is the issue of resistance, says Justin Talley, entomologist with Oklahoma State University.

He advises rotating the class of insecticide used to control horn fly populations. "I would say 90% of our pour on products controlling horn fl ies are mostly pyrethroids," Talley says. An organophosphate spray can thwart fl ies during the season. Using a macrocyclic lactone dewormer which include ivermetictin and moxidectin can help kill fl ies that still bite treated animals. Another concept is killing eggs in manure with feed-through products such as insect growth regulator (IGR) in mineral. The only problem is there are no guarantees all cattle will eat enough IGR in mineral to stop fly reproduction.

Another thought is to rotate pastures to move the manure load. Also, studies by Talley on spring patch burning have showed promise by reducing horn fl ies by 40% without using an insecticide at all.

Also, face flies, along with horn flies, are a problem that can be remedied using products such as fly tags.



# TICKS

The worry of ticks spreading illness through cattle populations has increased recently with the discovery of Asian longhorned ticks in several states and the ongoing threat of cattle fever ticks

along the Mexico-Texas border. Talley says longhorned ticks are a concern because they have displayed the ability to spread rapidly due to their asexual reproduction, resulting in a potential population boom. The tick carries a protozoal disease that causes damage to the "pocket book" rather than being deadly. "Animals are always getting a little sick, but never getting well," Talley adds. Some treatments for fl ies and worms should help in preventing the spread of these types of ticks and others.



# WORMS

There are several classes and types of dewormers that can help control the spread of parasitic worms, such as round worms. The emergence of longer-release dewormers has helped with the effectiveness of controlling the spread of worms among cattle says Gerald Stokka, North Dakota State University Extension veterinarian and associate professor of livestock stewardship.

Timing deworming is key. Stokka advises deworming a cowherd when grass is starting to green up because "basically all of the internal parasites in cattle are going to be picked up on grass."

Even with the injectable dewormers having a longer-release, Stokka has observed that some cowherds could stand to be injected later. For colder areas of the country like North Dakota this might mean waiting to administer a dewormer in May or June.

The issue of resistance also should be considered. Similar to the strategy with flies, it is important to rotate the class of dewormer that is used to limit the risk of breeding worms resistant to a particular dewormer.

Pasture rotation is something Stokka advises to help move cattle off of manure that might have worms. However, he does note areas such as New Mexico, where stocking densities are lower might not have the same concerns due to a lower concentration of cattle in one area.

Stokka implements many of these strategies in his family's own commercial and registered Red Angus cowherds.



# LICE

With winter weather holding strong in many areas of the country, lice might continue to do the same. "It is sometimes hard to put a number on any negative economic impact from lice," Stokka says.

Repairs to corrals that have been rubbed by cattle are common with herds afflicted by lice, but it can be hard to observe the more inconspicuous effects. Stokka notes in colder weather biting and sucking lice feeding increases, while at the same time it is hard to control lice.

Pour-on and injectable deworm-ers can help control lice, if the proper dosage is administered. Stokka also advises to use name-brand products rather than a generic because the quality control isn't quite there for generics.



# **Corral Work:** Part 1



It's important we talk about corral work for the simple reason of that's where we spend a lot of time with our livestock, and it's often a stressful time for both animals and humans. Also, it's unfortunately a great place to hurt performance and to teach our cattle that being in a herd is a bad place to be, which has negative ramifications for gathering, driving and settling cattle together as a herd.

Conventionally, people often have to force their cattle into the corral because it's someplace they don't want to be because of the treatment they've received there in the past—or so we think—and they have them in such an uncooperative mood they make the whole day difficult for them. But, of course, we don't understand that it's of our own doing and, instead, blame and curse our miserable old cows.

Bud Williams makes the important but generally unrecognized point that corral work begins long before we get them in the corral, and if we bring them in poorly by not using good technique and violate any of our principles, they're going to be unco-operative because their minds are going to be on going back.

### Entering a corral

Bud makes another important point: Cattle aren't afraid of the corral. It's how we bring them in; it's what we do to them before we even get there that matters to them. And if we bring them in properly we might

find that we can leave the gate open, and they won't leave because they'll be content being in there.

As far as driving cattle into a corral, one effective way is to have the riders zigzag in a T to the gate (discussed in prior articles), and have someone stationed near the gate to ride reverse-parallel as the

animals get close. This simple technique gets the all-important mind change in the animals of wanting to go into the corral to get past the rider, hence making our idea their idea (see Figure A).

When doing the reverse-parallel technique when entering a pen, it's important for the rider to focus on the lead animals and not go too far down the side. The objective is to keep the lead going which will draw the rest. Also, when the rider returns to the front to repeat the technique if



As this handler rides reverse-parallel as the animals approach the entrance, their attention shifts to him and wanting to get past him, which mentally puts

them in the pen.

necessary, they need to take a wide birth so they don't slow the animals with what would be a forwardparallel movement (see Figure B).

### Once in the corral

To make corral work as less stressful an experience as possible on the cattle, we cannot overcrowd them. Cattle don't like being crowded any more than we do. So it's little wonder those that have been over-crowded in the past might resist coming into a corral, and why they will be difficult to work once we get them in.

Then, once we begin to work the animals it's imperative we use proper technique.

### Emptying a pen from the back

Conventionally, everybody wants to go in and get behind the animals and drive them out. This is a viable approach as long as we do it correctly, and one way to do that is to get behind the animals and zigzag in a T to the gate, just as we do when bring-ing cattle into a corral (see Figure C).

## Emptying a pen from the front

A disadvantage of going to the back of the pen is the first thing that happens when we walk into a pen is every animal wants to see us. So, if we go to the back we're turning them away from the gate because they're looking at us. Also, when people go in a pen and circle around behind, the animals don't like that because it's predatorial.

So there are advantages to empty-ing a pen from the front, but work-ing between the cows and where we want them to go is very foreign to most people.

Bud Williams stated "I generally work between the cattle and where I want them to go." Why? Because it

What we should do is store our animals in corral pens and bring out drafts (as described in Corral Work: Part 1) and only use the alleyway for transport.

However, if we do use our alleyways for storage there are several things we can do to make it less stressful on the animals. First, we can give them plenty of room by storing fewer (see Figure A). Another thing we can do is put a person at the end of the alleyway to keep the animals from pressing up against the back. Also, as the handler comes to peel off another draft, the cattle will be facing forward so he or she can walk against the animals (i.e., reverse-parallel) along the fence to get them to come out past him or her (see Figure B).



These cattle are being stored in segments of the alleyway waiting their turn to go up to the processing area for preg testing. Note the generous space they are given to help keep them relaxed and in a normal frame of mind. In this regard, wider alley-ways are better (i.e., 14'-16') instead of 12' pictured here.



The job of the person in back (with the aid of a flag, if necessary) is to keep the animals facing forward and to stop them from going to the back of the alley every time the drafter comes back for another draft.

### One person driving cattle up an alleyway

Conventionally, how do people drive cattle up an alleyway? They generally fall in directly behind them and push (often with the aid of noise, stock whips, fl ags or paddles). But pushing on cattle from directly behind has several negative consequences: (1) they don't like it because we're in their blind spot; (2) so they try to pick up where we are; (3) so they're not moving ahead like they should; (4) and not driving the ones in front of them like they should; and (5) if we continually apply pressure from directly behind, some animals might break back to relieve the pressure.

As we've discussed in previous articles, there is a more effective way to drive cattle ahead from behind: the straight-lined, forward-angled zigzag (see Figure C).

### Two people driving cattle up an alleyway

If there are two people driving animals up an alleyway they should each stay close to the fence and zigzag behind the cattle in front of them. That keeps the animals going straight down the alleyway and not wanting to turn back (see Figure D on page 28).

### Working alleyways from the outside

Another way to effectively move cattle up an alleyway is to walk or ride reverse-parallel on the outside of

obeys our principles, in particular these three:

- \* Animals want to see what's pressuring them.
- \* They want to see where you want them to go.
- \* They want to go by you or around you.

So, if we want to have those principles work for us, where should we be? We should be between the animals and the gate. From there we can walk directly into the animals so they split around us and out the gate. This works especially well in a smaller corral with a lot of cattle (see Figure D). We can also work the front and side to start lead animals toward the gate which draws the rest.

There are two other advantages to emptying a pen from the front: (1) We can control the speed of movement from the front with the reverse- and forward-parallel techniques; and (b) we're in a position to take only the number we want, or count them, or do a health check (neither of which can be done from the back).

Getting cattle out of a corner If cattle are in a corner but close to the gate, what people usually do is go in behind them and drive them out, but that turns the lead out because the animals want to keep us, the source of pressure, in their sight.

What we should do is pressure the cattle into the corner at a 45-degree angle and back out. We pressure in to create movement, but then we have to back out for two reasons: (1) so we can pressure in again, if necessary, and (2) so we can guide them (see Figure E).



### **GUEST EDITORIAL**



Whit Hibbard is a fourthgeneration Montana rancher and the editor of Stockmanship Journal.



Drovers.com March 2019 OROVERS

Dawn Hnatow manages a cattle ranch in Texas.

# **Corral Work: Part 2**

Conventionally, alleyways are used not only for livestock movement, but for storage. From the low-stress perspective, however, this is hard on animals and will unnecessarily hurt performance. Cattle don't like to be crowded to the point that they bump into each other. When they are, their anxiety and stress levels go way up, and they'll likely be less cooperative because their minds will be going back to where they were last comfortable. What we're doing is making the whole corral experi-ence bad, which makes those cattle harder to work the next time.

For one thing, whenever we store animals in an alleyway and we go in from the front to peel off a draft to take to the crowd tub, scale, loading dock, etc., we are too tough on the ones in the back (i.e., all the animals crowd to the rear of the alley, which puts immense pressure on those in the back).



Whether on foot or horseback, the best way for one person to move cattle up an alleyway is to zigzag behind the middle part of the bunch, which draws the sides and corners. If you go too far across, those in the very back might turn crosswise, which is not conducive to good forward movement.

the alleyway. Attempting this inside an alleyway is too much pressure for most animals. As you pass each animal's balance point it should speed up in the direction it's going (see Figure E). If animals stall out An eff ective way to resume movement in animals that are stalled out in an alleyway is the "rocking" technique, in which you literally rock back and forth. This applies a surprising amount of pressure on animals and drives them ahead (see Figure F). Stopping animals that break back We first need to take responsibility for any animal

responsibility for any animal breaking back with the realization that we caused it (i.e., by overpressuring or being out of position). Animals only break back when we shove them from behind and they have nowhere else to go.

When an animal does break back, the conventional response is to jump in front of it to try to stop it.

But what does that do? It actually puts more pressure on the animal so it wants to go back even more.

(Remember Principle #12: Under excess pressure, animals want to go back where they came from.)

The better response is to back up a step or two. Th at instantly releases pressure on the animal, and it will almost always stop, reconsider and turn back to its mates.

### Stopping animals that are coming at you

To stop animals in an alleyway that are coming toward you, rock back and forth, and back up if necessary. Our tendency is to go directly at them, but that actually tells them to go by you because it is a reverse-parallel movement.

### **Conclusion**

Corral work can be a highly stressful time for our cattle, but it needn't be so if we apply low-stress prin-ciples and techniques, then they understand what we want and will willingly comply.



A seldom used but effective way to facilitate movement of animals up an alleyway is to work it from the outside with the reverse-parallel technique. If you need to repeat, it's important to make the triangular return (discussed in a prior article).



When rocking it is necessary to give the animals time to begin moving ahead, and it takes a while for the movement to domino through the herd all the way to the front. Once it does and the herd starts moving, advance with the herd keeping the same distance between you. At some point when the herd begins to move out, you will need to transition to the zigzag.





# Jeanne White, Owner **Phil Paradis, Manager**

**Groton**, NY 607-423-4888 cell anne@SimmeValley.com ww.SimmeValley.ComRN STATES **EXPOSITION** 2018

Simme Valley





that perform in and out of the show

# 2-25-18 Mack AF xin F Desa Rae X322





Visitors Are Always Welcome



# 2-24-17 Mack AF x HPF Desa Rae 811U

Show cattle & breeding stock for sale at all times. Bull calves & show steers available through the summer. We strive for Satisfied Customers. Our cattle work for us and their new owners, performing on grass in the summer and hay in the winter. Watch for our consignments to the Gettysburg Stars & Stripes Sale on the 1st Sat in May

# Simple Synchronization of Cows – One Injection, One Time through the Chute, and Bull Breed



By : Bethany Johnston, former Nebraska Extension Educator and Aaron Berger, Nebraska Extension Beef Educator

Have you wanted to have more calves born earlier in your calving season, but did not want to deal with the increase in labor, cost and facilities to utilize estrus synchronization and artificial insemination? The protocol shown (Figure 1.) can increase the number of cows coming into estrus early in the breeding season, with one time through the chute, one injection, and breeding using only natural service.



### Figure 1.

This protocol calls for bulls to be turned out with the cows on Day 0. On Day 5, cows are given a shot of prostaglandin (PGF2 $\alpha$ ) which synchronizes a majority of the cows to be in heat/estrus from Day 6 through Day 10. The injection of prostaglandin causes any cows with a corpus luteum present on one of their ovaries to regress, ceasing progesterone production. This then triggers the cows to come into heat/estrus.

If the cow conceives during Day 1 to 5, she will not abort when given the prostaglandin injection on Day 5 because the developing corpus luteum at the site of ovulation on the ovary has not yet reached maturity and will not respond to prostaglandin.

Research conducted at the Fort Keogh Research Center near Miles City, Montana utilized this protocol over a three year period, achieving pregnancy rates over 85% in a 32-day breeding season. Research from the University of Nebraska showed 75% of cows calved in the first 21 days of the calving season utilizing this estrus synchronization protocol as compared to only 63% of cows from non-synchronized natural service breeding.

Utilizing natural service with this method of estrus synchronization will require adequate bull power. A bull to cow ratio of 1:15 with yearling bulls or 1:25 with mature bulls should be sufficient. Because early breeding and the synchronized estrus is occurring over a 10 day period, fertile and active bulls with adequate libido should be able to handle the number of cows that will be coming into heat. Breeding bulls should undergo a breeding soundness exam prior to the breeding season.

Producers considering the use of this synchronization tool should remember that a number of factors affect pregnancy rate including cow body condition score, plane of nutrition, cattle health, and bull fertility.

Estrus synchronization can shorten the calving season. The article "Use of Natural Service Sires with Synchronized Estrus" highlights other advantages of estrus synchronization and natural service.

Note: A relatively new prostaglandin product, which is in a high-concentration formula, allows for a 2-mL dose to be injected subcutaneously (under the skin). Other prostaglandin products have an intramuscular injection (IM) label requirement, which requires a longer needle for deep muscle penetration. IM injections have a greater risk to develop lesions in the muscle that affects meat quality. The 2018 Nebraska Beef Report article "Comparison of Two Alternate Prostaglandin Products in Yearling Beef Heifers" showed beef heifers performed similarly to either the IM injection of prostaglandin or the subcutaneous injection of high-concentration prostaglandin.

# 

# Week-in-Review

# **Objectivity in Sorting Embryos** John Maday, July 1, 2019

In a cooperative study, researchers in human and livestock reproduction at Texas Tech University have demonstrated the potential for a new technique for evaluating viability of embryos used in embryo-transfer procedures.



The research report is published in the journal Human Reproduction.

The technique could help facilitate a higher success rate in using single embryo transfer (SET) by providing a more quantitative measure of viability.

Traditionally, the researchers note, embryo quality has been based solely on embryo morphology or morphology coupled with expected growth rates, with considerable variability in selection criteria for a "normal" embryo.

The researchers set out to determine whether observed differences in estimated weight within a cohort could be used to select high-quality embryos for transplant. In their initial studies, the team conducted experiments to determine whether estimated zygote weights could:

Distinguish viable from nonviable embryos.

Predict future development.

Demonstrate that the technique did not negatively impact growth rates compared with a control population.

The Texas Tech group developed a test that estimates the weight of an embryo based on specific gravity. They found that highly buoyant embryos with long descent times fail to develop at a significantly higher rate compared with the rest of the cohort. Their results, along with findings from earlier research suggests differences in embryo buoyancy and viability are associated with a large incorporation of lipids into the embryo cytoplasm, changes in the embryonic cytoplasm, chromosomal anomalies and differences in membrane integrity and the ability of individual cells to maintain osmoregulation. Read the full report from Human Reproduction. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4542720/ For more about advanced reproductive technologies in cattle, see these articles from BovineVetOnline: https://www.bovinevetonline.com/article/edwin-robertson-beginning-embryo-transfer-seminar https://www.bovinevetonline.com/article/ocyte-development-during-negative-energy-balance

CLASSIFIED AD: ASA #3099275, solid red bull sired by Amigo out of a Beef Maker cow. Been used on heifers successfully. Price \$2900 OBO. Corner View Farm 315-856-0413



# Underfeeding Beef Cows Has Consequences

by: North Dakota State University Extension, April 8, 2019

Beef cows that have been underfed during gestation and lactation will be less productive than cows fed adequate diets.

"For adequate production, a beef cow's daily ration must meet nutritional requirements," says Karl Hoppe, North Dakota State University Extension livestock systems specialist at the Carrington Research Extension Center. "Cows will lose body weight when consuming less energy than needed for maintaining body functions and production demands."

Extreme cold temperatures or wind chills will increase the cow's energy needs substantially. If the cow doesn't receive additional energy through her diet, she will take nutrients from her body to meet her energy demands.

Production problems will occur when the cow loses too much weight. However, a heavier cow will be able to lose more weight than a thin cow before serious production problems occur.

A visual method for determining weight loss or gain in beef cows is body condition scoring (BCS). Beef cows that carry more condition (or fat) will rate a higher body condition score (maximum of BCS 9) than thin cows (minimum of BCS 1). A body condition score of 4 is borderline for maintaining adequate production in beef cows.

## Thin Cows Take Longer to Rebreed

"Cows with a body condition score of 4 or less at calving will have poor reproductive performance," says John Dhuyvetter, NDSU Extension livestock systems specialist at the No. Central Research Extension Center near Minot.

After calving, thin cows will require more days to reach first estrus (heat) and more days to become pregnant. Researchers report that cows with a borderline or lower BCS need an average of 12 more days to reach first estrus. For example, they found that cows with a BCS of 4 or less needed 61 days while cows with a BCS of 5 or greater needed 49 days to reach first estrus.

Changing Body Condition Scores in Borderline (BCS 4) Cows After Calving							
Condition Score Change	<0	0 to 1	1 to 2	>2			
Average BCS change	41	.49	1.22	2.44			
Days of pregnancy	150.9	126.7	106.3	98.8			
Milk production (lb./day, day 60)	11.2	13.2	14.5	15.4			

Source: NDSU Extension

In addition, beef cows in this study with a BCS of 4 or less took six more days to become pregnant when compared with a cow with a BCS of 5 or greater (90 vs. 84 days). The researchers also found that 84 percent of cows with a BCS of 4 or less were pregnant within 60 days after calving, compared with 91 percent of cows with a BCS of 5 or greater.

For thin cows, increasing the level of energy in the diet after calving will increase the number of pregnant cows at 60 days after giving birth. Cows with a BCS of 4 or less will have comparable pregnancy rates to cows with BCS of 5 or greater when fed a diet that allows for maintaining or gaining weight after calving through rebreeding.

In this study, the amount of energy fed daily was 15.6, 12.6 and 8.9 pounds of total digestible nutrients (TDN) per head daily for high-, moderate- and low-feed energy diets, respectively. The amount of energy fed daily during flushing was 21.8 pounds of TDN.

# Feed Level Influences Percent of Cows Pregnant Within 60 Days After Calving

Feed Energy	Postcalving Average Daily Gain	Body Condition Score 4 or less 5 or grea		
High	1-2 lb. gain	92	92	
Moderate	none	92	88	
Low	1-2 lb. loss	68	85	
Low-flushed*	1-2 lb. loss	85	98	
Average		84	91	

\*Flushed 14 days prior to breeding then flushed for 14 days prior to and 30 after bull turnout. The flushing diet for this study was 9 to 13 pounds grain plus free-choice corn silage.

Source: NDSU Extension

## Flushing an Alternative

Flushing is a management term for providing additional high-quality feeds and grains to cows starting 14 days prior to the start of the breeding season and continuing throughout the first 30 days of breeding. Cows that lost weight after calving but gain weight prior to and during breeding will have a higher pregnancy rate than cows that do not regain weight.

Specifically for thin cows (BCS 4), increasing the concentration of energy in the diet will increase milk production at 90 days after calving and also reduce the days to pregnancy.

# **Additional Detrimental Effects of Underfeeding**

Beef cows that are underfed during gestation and lactation may have additional areas of poor production. Here are two of the issues:

Underfeeding during gestation will reduce birth weights but may increase the number of difficult births, or dystocia.

Undernourished or thin cows may have reduced quantity and quality of colostrum. Colostrum is a form of milk that mammals produce in late pregnancy. It contains energy, protein, fat and vitamins, plus antibodies to protect newborns against disease until their own immune system is totally functional. Lower-quality colostrum may result in calves with more illnesses (scours) during early lactation. Reduced immunity also may lead to poorer calf survival rates.

"A ration should be balanced for energy, crude protein, minerals and vitamins," Hoppe says. "Nutrients are needed by the cow in constant proportions every day. Any nutrient deficiency will lead to reduced digestion and metabolism. Reducing nutrients below the animals' requirements might reduce feed costs but will also limit production."

Energy can be underfed in a diet to manage energy reserves (BCS or body fat). However, protein needs to be supplemented.

"The most efficient nutritional management strategy is through feeding adequate amounts of nutrients daily," Dhuyvetter says. "Matching energy needs during cold weather stress by increasing feed energy helps cows survive extreme cold weather."



## DIRECTORY CORRECTION – I FAILED TO INCLUDE THIS LIST OF MEMBERS IN OUR NEW 2019-2020 DIRECTORY. OUR DIRECTORY ON LINE HAS BEEN CORRECTED. THIS PAGE HAS BEEN PRINTED AND INSERTED IN THE DIRECTORIES. I AM EXTREMELY SORRY FOR THIS ERROR.

#### Upstream Dream Farm 75 Jeff McMasters 3692 Taylor Valley Rd. Cincinnatus, NY 13040

Mostly Angus cow/calves breeding to Simme Valley bulls. Trying to retire.

#### Wayward Wind Ranch 76

**Richard & Michelle Phillips** 3974 Franklin Street Rd. Auburn, NY 13021 Red Angus cow/calf herd.

#### 77 White House Farm

Ron & Kathi Tavlor 887 Hunlock Harveyville Road, Shickshinny, P.A. 18655 Cow/calf operation. 10 miles from US Route 11, Luzerne County.

#### 78 Willow Ridge Farm

Tyler & Ashley Miller 4651 Quarry Rd, Warsaw, NY 14569 Cow/calf operation.

#### 79 Windcrest Farm

cell 315-558-0675 Gary W. & Terre Gordon 4314 Wyckoff Road, Scipio Center, NY 13147 Commercial Hereford/Angus/Simmental cross. Marketing private treaty and sell feeders in the fall. 6 Mi on Rt 34 South of Auburn, left on Skillet Rd, Corner of Wyckoff & Skillet.

80 Windy Hill Farm John & Kris Walston 9244 Harris Rd. Lee Center, NY 13363 Membership compliments of The Bunal Farm.

#### 81 Wood Farm

Barry & Stacey Wood 94 Scofield Rd Walton, NY 13856 Small cow/calf.

#### 82 Wooded Acres

585-367-3865 Home Mike Baker 607-227-6320 Cell 4286 Reed Road, Livonia, N.Y. 14487 Commercial cow/calf operation/backgrounder. Beef Specialist at Cornell Univ.

willowridgefarm4651@gmail.com

315-253-3569

315-533-6935

bwood94@frontiernet.net 607-865-4982

mjbaker@hughes.net

570-256-3482

585-689-4305

315-255-1808

WaywardWindRanch@hotmail.com

upstream65@hotmail.com

607-745-5567





NYS Fair Simmental Show – Sept. 1, 12:00 noon Followed by a pot luck dinner and the Junior Auction. Donated items are appreciated. All proceeds benefit the juniors.

NEW YORK SIMMENTAL ASSN. Jeanne White – Simme Valley 6493 Stauber Rd, Groton, NY 13073-9430