A series of questions recently crossed my desk about the latest recommendations for stocking density. As I was answering the questions it struck me as a good article for Farm Report readers.

What are the recommendations for 2- and 3-row freestall pens for far-off dry, close-up and lactating pens? Currently there are no separate recommendations for 2- versus 3-row pens although it’s a common question. The majority of published research has been conducted in either 2-row pens or under conditions that simulate the lower feedbunk competition inherent in 2-row pens. I have recommended to not exceed 120% stocking rate of stalls based on the observation that resting time is always reduced at stocking rates beyond 120% (and sometimes at less than 120%) and the few studies that have measured milk yield have found that herd production is reduced markedly beyond 120%. For 3-row pens it’s ideal not to exceed 100-110% in my opinion given the greater competition for bunk space. Two important caveats: with commingled pens by parity and for lame cows, stall stocking density should not exceed 100%.

What are the recommendations for 2- and 3-row freestall pens for far-off dry, close-up and lactating pens? Currently there are no separate recommendations for 2- versus 3-row pens although it’s a common question. The majority of published research has been conducted in either 2-row pens or under conditions that simulate the lower feedbunk competition inherent in 2-row pens. I have recommended to not exceed 120% stocking rate of stalls based on the observation that resting time is always reduced at stocking rates beyond 120% (and sometimes at less than 120%) and the few studies that have measured milk yield have found that herd production is reduced markedly beyond 120%. For 3-row pens it’s ideal not to exceed 100-110% in my opinion given the greater competition for bunk space. Two important caveats: with commingled pens by parity and for lame cows, stall stocking density should not exceed 100%.

The data for close-up and fresh pens are scarce. Based on one study at the University of Wisconsin, the standard recommendation has been to not stock beyond 80-90% of bunk space. The reasoning is that bunk space is critical to the transition cow given the strong correlation between bunk space, competition, natural feeding behavior, and metabolic disorders. Greater bunk stocking density (above 100%) in the fresh pen increases rate of eating which would be a potential negative for fresh cows. Given the focus on bunk space for transition pens, you would need to recommend very low stall stocking rates for 3-row pens. Many farmers would not accept these low stall stocking rates, so it’s critical to ensure that other factors in the cow’s environment are optimized such as time away from the pen, feed availability 24/7, comfortable deep bedded stalls, good ventilation, etc. Time outside the pen is a key factor, and time in excess of about 3.5 h/d for healthy cows will exacerbate the negative effects of overstocking (times in excess of 2 h/d will be detrimental to moderately lame cows).

For bedded packs, what is the recommended area for far-off dry, close-up, and lactating pens? There are virtually no research data to support recommendations for bedded pack space. The usual recommendations of 120-150 sq. ft/cow are based on what has appeared to work satisfactorily on farm. Providing ample resting space for transition pens is critical and a common recommendation is 140-150 sq. ft/cow.

See STOCKING, Page 6
Cooperative Extension in Central NY is offering a series of “horse hay” meetings intended for equine owners, a commendable effort since horse owners certainly need help in making hay purchase decisions. My first experience with horse hay was as a 16-year-old in Connecticut, working at a stable offering trail and pony rides. We had two dozen horses and ponies and bought all our hay. (We also had two Jersey cows that I milked by hand but that’s another story.) I’d spent all that Saturday riding in a modest competition — barrel racing, keyhole and the like — did well though much more due to the horse than to its rider. I drove the horse trailer back to the stable, got the horse put away and was ready to call it a day when a huge truckload of grass hay pulled into the yard. Three-wire bales made with a stationary bale press, a wood chip with the weight of the bale tucked under the middle wire. The lightest was about 125 lbs, the heaviest 175 lbs. By the time we finished unloading that hay a college education was starting to look real good.

Over the years I’ve established my own hay rating system, from best to worst:

1. Hay for race horses. Not “horse hay” but the very best alfalfa on the market, leafy and green with no grass, dust, mold or bleached-out stems. Racehorse people are picky but with the price they’re willing to pay they have a right to be.

2. Dairy quality hay. Good color, mowed in the bud or boot stage, baled “right”. Usually pure or mostly alfalfa.

3. Beef quality hay. Not very common in the Northeast, mostly or all grass, fair quality but a notch or two below dairy hay.

4. Heifer hay. Late cut and/or rained on at least once but still not so awful that a heifer won’t eat it. OK if fed as a modest part of a TMR along with better quality forages.

5. Horse hay for backyard horses. Similar to heifer hay except that it contains little or no alfalfa, must be dust-free and has at least a trace of green color since the horse owner was told that green is good. Horse hay often is fully-headed first cut timothy since this is the only grass species many backyard horse owners recognize. I’ve seen good quality bromegrass turned down by a horse owner because it didn’t look like timothy.

6. Mulch hay. The worst of the worst, mowed for the first time in midsummer and often rained on repeatedly. Depending on the seller’s ethics and the knowledge level of the buyer, 5. and 6. are sometimes interchangeable, often the result of the buyer asking “What do you have that’s cheap?”

— E.T.
WHAT’S HAPPENING ON THE FARM

There’s been a lot of activity on the farm this past month. Our maintenance crew has been busy installing new curtains in the barn before the snow starts to fly, and we had new stall mattresses installed in pen 1. The cows are definitely enjoying lying on their new comfortable beds, and I’m sure we’ll all be thankful for the new curtains once the cold weather hits.

Early in October the Holstein classifier came and spent a day and a half scoring our herd. Mike Weimer not only scored 283 animals, he also gave us an in-depth lesson about classification and the linear scoring system. We learned that a cow’s final score is based on five major categories: front end and capacity, dairy strength, rump, feet and legs, and udder. Each category score ranges from 1-100 points and contributes a percentage to the final score, with udder being worth the most at 40%. In the final score, the classifier also considers the age of the cow, number of lactations, and stage of lactation. I definitely gained a new perspective in classifying cattle and its importance. It’s good to get an unbiased opinion of your herd’s strengths and weaknesses compared to the most ideal of the breed. This information can be used to make important mating decisions and identifies the best animals in your herd, as well as adding marketability to your animals. This experience was a great learning opportunity. We even ended up with a new excellent cow and an 86-point heifer!

Lately we have had some concerns with 4th or greater lactation cows calving in with low calcium levels. In the time just before a cow calves large amounts of calcium are removed from the blood and used up by the mammary gland to produce colostrum. As the mass of the calcium pool rapidly drops, the failure of calcium to be absorbed into the bloodstream fast enough after the onset of lactation can cause a cow to get milk fever, or hypocalcemia. Cows can be predisposed to this disease if the calcium or phosphorus intake is too high or too low, if they don’t eat enough in the closeup period, or if they have trouble absorbing minerals.

A normal calcium level would be 8.0 mg/dl or above, but we have been having a few cows below that benchmark within the first 18-24 hours after calving. Most of these cows are not showing signs of clinical milk fever but are either a bit lethargic in the fresh pen or even acting normally. This subclinical milk fever is something that we are looking to improve, and with our calving study currently in progress in which our close-up cows are eating out of Calan bins we’re able to get individual intakes of each cow, giving us the perfect opportunity to dig into this issue.

We feed a DCAD (Dietary Cation-Anion Difference) diet to dry cows, which is balanced for anions (negatively charged molecules) and cations (positively charged molecules). Balancing the ration to have a negative DCAD value increases the efficiency of calcium absorption into the blood. Urine acidity is affected by this, so Anna and I have recently started taking weekly urine samples of closeup cows to test their pH, which has been all over the board. By using this information, we hope to check the effectiveness of our DCAD diet with our nutritionist and make any changes necessary.

In recent weeks our cows have been milking between 97-99 lbs a day with an average SCC under 100,000. It amazes me how when you have a group of people dedicated to taking care of these animals, making sure that they are well fed, healthy, and comfortable, they will repay you in the best way. This is what makes farming so rewarding.

With the end of the year coming up fast, so is budget time. Steve Couture, the farm manager, has been busy meeting with others to discuss planning for the next year, estimating farm income and discussing farm expenses and purchases for 2018. This planning is essential to the farm, ensuring we are able to keep advancing our dairy and crops into the future.

— Victoria Vendetta
vendetta@whminer.com
SEED CORN ORDERS

If by the end of November you haven’t been visited by at least one seed dealer it’s probably because you don’t grow corn. November is when many farmers order seed corn even though the timing isn’t ideal since it’s often too early for the current year’s university corn hybrid trial results to be available. However, seed dealers know that the first one on the farm, order book in hand, will often get at least some of the farmer’s business. The timing of release of trial data may not be as much of an issue these days because some seed companies no longer enter their corn hybrids in university trials, and some university silage hybrid trials have been discontinued for financial reasons. Following are a few comments as you consider your seed corn orders, with the focus on corn silage:

• With the notable exception of BMR there’s only a small difference in NDF digestibility among corn hybrids. Some seed companies claim otherwise but forage analyses don’t lie. However there are considerable differences in yield and starch content, so you still need to carefully select corn hybrids for silage regardless of whether they’re silage-only or dual-purpose.
• Leafy corn hybrids are great-looking in the field, which is a big reason for the popularity of “leafies”. Not only are there up to twice as many leaves but the extra leaves are all above the ear where they’re easy to see even from a pickup truck. Anything that looks good from the pickup truck seat has added value, especially for farmers with an ego to massage — which is pretty much all of them. Research hasn’t shown a consistent difference in yield or silage quality between leafy and conventional corn hybrids, so make purchase decisions based on trial data or your own experience, not just on the leafy trait.
• Fifty years ago (before leafy or BMR hybrids were on the market) Cornell University animal scientists stated that the best grain hybrid was the best silage hybrid. No three Pinocchios for that statement, which for dual-purpose hybrids would still be rated as “mostly true”. That’s because so much of the yield difference in corn hybrids is due to grain content.
• Don’t push relative maturity too far. If you know that your location and planting dates put you in a 90-day RM zone, don’t load up on 100-RM hybrids. Plant breeders have done a great job of increasing the performance of early-maturity hybrids; buy those that will reliably mature on your farm. (Note italics.) If you want to shoot for the moon with a later-maturing hybrid limit it to no more than 10% of your corn acreage. You’ve heard this before but from the number of sub-30% DM corn silage samples I continue to come across it’s obvious that there are some slow learners out there.

—— Ev Thomas ethomas@oakpointny.com

CORN HYBRID TERMS DEFINED

Farmers can be forgiven if they’re confused about the various corn hybrid terms tossed around by agronomists and seed dealers. Here’s a brief explanation of how the Crops Dude understands and uses the terms:

Conventional and dual purpose are terms that are used interchangeably, referring to corn hybrids that can be used for either grain or silage harvest. Most are bred primarily for grain production, a good assumption given that 95% of seed corn sold in the U.S. is purchased with the intention of harvest as grain. A small amount is planted with the intention of grain harvest but because of unexpected events (weather, disease, bugs, etc.) winds up being chopped for silage, but even so only 6-7% of the U.S. corn crop is harvested for silage.

Almost all BMR seed corn has been sold by Dow-Mycogen and DuPont-Pioneer, with Mycogen focusing on the BM-3 gene and Pioneer on the BM-1 gene. Each company has claimed that the gene it uses is superior — big surprise, eh? Now that the two behemoths have merged into Dow DuPont we’ll eventually learn where the company will be positioning itself with regards to BMR including the BM-1 vs. BM-3 issue. For the coming year there will be both Mycogen and Pioneer BMR hybrids on the market, and looking ahead the assumption is that Dow Dupont will continue developing and marketing BMR hybrids.

Silage only hybrids include a wide range of genetics including BMR, leafy, soft kernel texture, and others promoted as having high digestibility. BMR is reliably higher in NDF-d but also reliably lower in yield — as indicated by university trial results. Other silage-only hybrids have given mixed results, with some doing well in yield and forage quality in university hybrid testing programs while others are no better than the average dual-purpose hybrid. If a seed company promotes a hybrid as “silage only”, don’t harvest it for grain without first checking with the seed company. There may be a very good reason why the hybrid is promoted for silage but not grain. This definitely includes BMR hybrids.

—— E.T.
I recently had the opportunity to attend the Cornell Nutrition Conference, and one of the presentations that really resonated was the talk given by Dr. Tom Overton. His presentation was a discussion of how we make decisions (management, financial, etc.) on farm. Dr. Overton explained that taking considerations into making type I and II errors, a more statistical approach, is a wise train of thought. This article will focus on what that means, what it will require from the producer, and how we can implement this line of reasoning into everyday situations.

Type I and II errors are one of the first topics covered in most introductory statistics courses. Some of you may be familiar with this, and it may bring back some not-so-pleasant memories of a college course you took (as it does for me). A Type I error, simply put, is making a decision to implement something and having it not work out. Type II errors are the opposite, meaning not implementing something when you should have. Both situations have unfavorable outcomes, but we can ask which has the bigger risk. Dr. Overton pointed out that it probably depends upon the size of investment and magnitude of commitment. This is very important to understand, and in order to have that understanding we will need a few things.

One thing it will require from the producer is a snapshot of their financials. Knowing a partial budget and the changes in revenue and investment will allow us to calculate the potential economic return. We’ll also need to know the cost of the change. Whether that’s a change in fresh cow treatment, facilities, or feed ingredients, we’ll need to know what it will cost and the potential outcome. We’ll also need to understand the expected timeline of return for the change or investment. To do so we’ll need to look into the research that was done on the change we are considering. Look into how it was researched, the change that was observed, and take into consideration how repeatable that outcome will be on your farm. Another requirement is an understanding of how this change will affect the system as a whole. If it is a change in management, how easily can the task be completed? Who will do the task and how will it affect the cow’s time budget? Keep it real: Can the change be done consistently and the correct way?

After gathering all of this information it’s time to bring it back to thinking of it in terms of Type I and II errors. If we were to implement the change will it be more detrimental to not see the economic return we expected or to leave potential money on the table by not making the change? Another important aspect to take into consideration is how will a change in milk price affect the economic return and cost of the change?

In summary, the goal is to make the correct/best decisions on the farm. This will not always happen, and it’s important to understand the risk of the change. I suggest using a program like Microsoft Excel to save your calculations and also to make it easy to reference the numbers used to calculate the outcomes. Evaluate this on a regular basis and update it when appropriate.

─ Wyatt Smith
smith@whminer.com

Learn more about Miner Institute, visit www.whminer.org

“No other occupation is so vitally important to the human race, nor requires such a wide range of practical and technical knowledge, as farming.”
─ William H. Miner, 1915
LACTOSE INTOLERANT? – THE CASE FOR STOPPING AT THE DAIRY CASE!

As someone who grew up looking forward to my bowl of cereal for breakfast and my glass of milk every evening with supper, I felt bad for those who were deprived of milk consumption due to their lactose intolerance. Nearly 75% of the world population maldigests lactose because genetically they have developed an inability to break down the milk sugar lactose in the intestine after they were weaned. These individuals avoid dairy foods, resulting in a lower calcium intake of 200 to 300 mg/day. This lower calcium intake leads to reduced bone density and increased likelihood of bone fractures. Although there are many dairy alternatives on the market, nothing compares to the real deal when it comes to taste and nutrition.

However, there might be some good news for lactose intolerant and maldigesters! Dr. Dennis Savaiano, Professor of Nutrition Policy at Purdue University, has some tips on how to tolerate lactose. Everyone can digest lactose in some capacity, so the most important factor to consider is the dose of lactose. The lactose in 8 oz. of milk is far less concentrated than the lactose in the solutions used for lactose intolerance testing. In a blinded protocol study by Savaiano it was found that those who described themselves as severely lactose intolerant behaved the same as other lactose maldigesters when consuming up to five 8 oz. servings of milk (the daily recommendation of 8 oz. servings is three). The research found that slowing down digestion by consuming milk with a meal, such as over a bowl of cereal or with supper, will also improve lactose digestion by three times compared to drinking milk alone. Even if this quick fix doesn’t solve all your lactose-driven maladies, Dr. Savaiano suggests that you can train your body to adapt over time to digesting lactose if you can move beyond your learned aversion.

For those with more significant cases of lactose intolerance, one cup of milk at a time may still be too much, even if taken with a meal. Dr. Savaiano suggests starting with a small amount, such as a quarter of a cup per day, and gradually increase the amount. Essentially, this will train the intestinal bacteria to aid in the digestion of lactose, thus eliminating symptoms of lactose intolerance. If milk still presents too much lactose, an alternative may be hard cheeses, which tend to be better tolerated due to lower levels of lactose. In addition, yogurts contain their own enzymes that are active in the digestion of lactose in the intestines. For some people these strategies may not be enough to solve their lactose maldigestion issues, but they owe it to themselves to try!

Dairy food intake is crucial to building stronger bone density because there are very few other good sources of calcium in the American diet. Bone density development occurs around puberty, peaks by early adulthood, and starts to decrease as we get older. However, adequate calcium and vitamin D intake from milk, in addition to regular and proper exercise, can help in maintaining bone density. As the human life expectancy continues to increase, our bones must be able to maintain density for a longer amount of time. I might be jinxing myself here, but at least up to this point in my life I have never broken a bone. This seems miraculous considering my complete lack of coordination even carrying out normal day to day activities, compounded with growing up working with cattle and horses. For me though, it’s pretty easy to see that the proof is in the pudding – which happens to be a dairy-based product.

— Ashley Cate
cate@whminer.com

STOCKING, Continued from Page 1

Remember that the square footage is needed for lying activity and also to allow for sufficient activity and social interactions. Cows do not distribute themselves uniformly within a bedded pack - often they will tend to "clump" together but still there is the need for ample room for social interactions in addition to resting. There is currently a study being conducted at Miner Institute in collaboration with Ohio State University that focuses on determining what impact stocking density of the close up pen (and resulting square footage) has on behavior and health outcomes at calving. Stay tuned for results of that study.

Research continues to accumulate that will allow us to better manage stocking rates of various pens of cattle on our farms. However, common questions remain and we are working to answer them such as 2- versus 3-row pens and bedded pack space needs. Additionally, western dairies rely heavily on open lot systems and we really need information on space requirements in these systems.

— Rick Grant
grant@whminer.com
PARTICLE SIZE: THE BALANCING ACT

Total mixed rations (TMR) contain a variety of ingredients from corn silage to fine ground corn, so making sure there is enough physically effective neutral detergent fiber (peNDF) is important for rumen health and performance. Particle size is the measure of the physical characteristic of feedstuffs and rations. There are several methods to measure particle size and for this article, we will focus on Penn State Particle Separator (PSPS), which is a sieving device with 19.0, 8.0, and 1.18 mm screens and a bottom pan. A 1997 Journal of Dairy Science article by David Mertens stated that peNDF is the fiber that supports normal ruminal function, and is measured by multiplying the proportion of particles above the 1.18 mm screen referred to as the physical effectiveness factor (pef) by total ration NDF.

There’s a balance between particle size for rumen health and performance. Longer particles in the dairy cow’s ration will take longer to eat but she will ruminate more which will create a healthier rumen environment. If the cow’s time budget is short due to overstocking of the pen or long time away from feed for milking then longer particle size will negatively influence dry matter intake (DMI). Pennsylvania State University reported that increasing the particle size of corn silage in the ration decreased DMI and increased the amount of time spent eating per kilogram of NDF. In a study conducted last fall at Miner Institute we varied particle size of straw (0.82 vs. 0.66 pef) at 6.67% of dry matter of the diet, and the cows fed the longer straw tended to spend more time eating. When particles are too long it will cause the cow to spend more time eating and will negatively influence DMI.

We recently finished a study using timothy hay chopped to the same length of the straw as in the study we did last fall. The straw and hay were processed through a hay buster with 2 and 3 inch screens for the long particles, while the short particles of the straw and hay were re-processed using a ½ and 3/8 inch screens. When we started to compare the straw and hay, they were similar in particle length, but the width of the straw particles were larger than the hay (see photo). The pef for the long and short straw were 0.82 and 0.66 respectively. These are much higher than the pef for the long and short hay (0.58 and 0.24), suggesting that hay is more fragile and breaks down faster. The straw has 26.2% more NDF than hay (81.5 vs. 55.3% of dry matter), confirming that the hay is more digestible than the straw. It’s hard to tell by visual inspection if there is such a large difference between the straw and hay, but it becomes evident when using the PSPS and feed analysis. As we make forage changes it’s important to use the PSPS and feed analysis to adjust the ration for optimal peNDF.

As dairy cow rations have increased energy, it is important to have adequate peNDF for rumen health, but not so much as to limit DMI. Utilizing tools such as PSPS and feed analysis will help to ensure that there is enough peNDF in the ration. With all rations it’s important to monitor how the cows are performing. If the cows are starting to show signs of low pH than increasing the peNDF of the ration is a good idea, but if the cows have lower intakes and are not producing what is expected than there might be an opportunity to reduce particle size.

— Mike Miller
mdmiller@whminer.com
OK, after reading the above title, how many of you had a “Duh” slip out of your mouth or bounce around in your head? C’mon, be honest. I have to admit that as I wrote it, I said “Duh” to myself. It’s common knowledge that cows go through a period of negative energy balance during early lactation where they mobilize energy reserves to meet the demands of high production. During this period, cows in negative energy balance may have more metabolic health and fertility problems. Researchers from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of São Paulo and Federal University of Dourados in Brazil have recently published a study in the latest issue of Theriogenology (volume 104, pages 30-36) that provides additional insight.

The objectives of the study were to evaluate the association between changes in body condition score (BCS) during transition period (3 weeks before to 3 weeks after calving) to circulating NEFA, BHBA, milk production and pregnancy at first AI. Cows were grouped based on BCS change between day -21 to day 21 relative to calving (Figure 1). The percentage of cows that gained, maintained, or lost BCS were 28%, 22%, and 50%, respectively. Milk yields from 21 – 77 DIM were similar across BCS groups, averaging approximately 101 lbs/day. They found that 62.9% of the cows that lost BCS during the transition period had more than 1 health problem during the transition period. The cows that gained BCS during the transition period were ovulating sooner, had a greater percent of cows cycling by 50 DIM, and a higher 1st service pregnancy rate than cows that maintained or lost BCS during the transition period.

For me, the most interesting part about this data is the impact of BCS change during the transition period had more than 1 health problem during the transition period. The cows that gained BCS during the transition period were ovulating sooner, had a greater percent of cows cycling by 50 DIM, and a higher 1st service pregnancy rate than cows that maintained or lost BCS during the transition period.

For me, the most interesting part about this data is the impact of BCS change from -21 to -7 DIM on animal health and reproductive performance. As the authors of this paper concluded, these results may push us to reconsider BCS recommendations during the 21 days prior to calving in order to optimize animal health and reproductive performance of our high producing dairy cows.

—Katie Ballard
ballard@whminer.com

### Table 1. Effect of BCS change during transition period on reproductive parameters and health (adapted from Barletta et al. 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Gained BCS</th>
<th>Maintained BCS</th>
<th>Lost BCS</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1 Health Problem, %</td>
<td>39.4b</td>
<td>46.2b</td>
<td>62.9a</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Ovulation, DIM</td>
<td>33.9c</td>
<td>37.9b</td>
<td>47.1a</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclic Cows at 50 DIM, %</td>
<td>100a</td>
<td>94.4b</td>
<td>81.1c</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preg/first AI, %</td>
<td>45.5a</td>
<td>25b</td>
<td>15.7b</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 1. Body condition score for cows on days -21, -7, 7 and 21 DIM that gained, maintained and lost BCS during transition period (adapted from Barletta et al. 2017).
SAVE THE DATE: DAIRY DAY 2017
Thursday, Dec. 7
10 am - 3 pm

Meeting Agenda
• 10 - 10:45 a.m. — Dr. Rick Grant, Miner Institute
  *Feed Bunk Management to Make Milk from Forage*
• 10:45 - 11:45 a.m. — Dr. Mike Van Amburgh, Cornell University
  *Concepts in Forage Feeding*
• 11:45 a.m. - 12:45 p.m. — Lunch and Door Prizes
• 12:45 - 1:15 p.m. — Dr. Mike Van Amburgh, Cornell University
  *Feeding Forages Harvested in 2017*
• 1:15 - 2 p.m. — Wyatt Smith, Mike Miller, Kate Creutzinger, Miner Institute
  *Hot Topics in Dairy Research*
• 2 -2:45 p.m. — Dr. Heather Dann, Miner Institute
  *New Milk Analyses to Help Tweak Diets and Management*

Hot lunch will be available for $5

Dairy Day is free and open to the public.
Pre-registration is encouraged.
For more information contact:
Wanda Emerich, 518-846-7121, ext. 117 or Emerich@whminer.com

Miner Institute is located at 586 Ridge Rd. Chazy, NY. Travel on Miner Farm Road, Route 191-1 mile west of Interstate 87, exit 41. Travel time is approximately 1 hour south of Montreal, 20 minutes north of Plattsburgh, NY, 1.5 hours from Burlington, VT, or 3 hours north of Albany, NY.

Dairy Day is an educational seminar held annually at Miner Institute.
Find proceedings from past year's meetings at http://whminer.org/outreach/
2017 FEED DEALER SEMINAR

The Feed Dealer Seminars are specifically targeted for nutritionists, veterinarians, crop and management consultants, extension educators, and dairy producers with specific interest in nutrition-oriented topics. They are designed to blend the latest concepts in feeding and other management aspects of dairies with field level application.

November 29
6 to 9 p.m.
The Joseph C. Burke Education and Research Center auditorium at Miner Institute
586 Ridge Rd., Chazy, NY

For more information, contact:
Wanda Emerich – (518) 846-7121, ext. 117
Sara Bull – (518) 561-7450

Speakers:
• Tom Overton, Ph.D., Professor of Dairy Management and Director, PRO-DAIRY program, Cornell University
• Rob Lynch, DVM., Dairy Herd Health and Management Specialist, PRO-DAIRY program, Cornell University
• Allison Kerwin, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Animal Science, Cornell University

Topics:
• Dealing with forage quality challenges
• Research update – strategies to manage hypocalcemia
• Antibiotics on the farm – VFD update and results from selective dry cow therapy trial

SAVE THE DATE: January 18, 2018
Disaster Preparedness Workshop
1-3:30 p.m.
The Joseph C. Burke Education and Research Center at Miner Institute
586 Ridge Rd. Chazy, NY

*Look for more details in the December Farm Report.

Is there something you would like to know more about?
Send Farm Report article suggestions to Rachel at dutil@whminer.com
The Bride and I have a slight difference of opinion over the place for wild geranium, also called wild cranesbill (*Geranium maculatum*), in our gardens. T.B. likes it because it’s not aggressive, has attractive foliage and pretty pink flowers. I don’t like it because it sheds seeds like a Labrador retriever sheds hair and keeps popping up where I don’t want it to, which is anywhere in our gardens. When we’re out in the garden together and I spy one growing in an otherwise open area she often says “Don’t pull it up, it’s better than nothing.” So I don’t — at least not while she’s looking.

Wild geraniums in our flower gardens and dandelions in your alfalfa fields have at least one characteristic in common: Neither is very competitive. This may come as a surprise to a farmer looking at a field of alfalfa that’s turned into a sea of yellow flowers, but dandelions don’t invade and push alfalfa plants out, they simply fill in where the alfalfa has died. Nature abhors a vacuum; so do dandelions and other weeds, yet another reason why I generally prefer alfalfa-grass over clear alfalfa. You’ll have far fewer dandelions if you include a few pounds of grass seed with your alfalfa. However, unlike most weeds dandelions have similar forage quality to alfalfa — about the same crude protein and digestible nutrients. One reason for dandelions’ bad reputation is that their lush foliage can delay the drying of alfalfa, but this is more of an issue in dry baled hay than with alfalfa silage. For farmers who harvest their alfalfa for silage, dandelions are more likely to hurt their pride than reduce forage quality.

— E.T.
The McGregor Powerhouse (seen here during a staff tour in early October) was operational from its construction in 1922 until 1961. It was built by William Miner and helped to produce power for Heart's Delight Farm. The powerhouse is currently owned by the town of Altona. The McGregor power system is featured in a special hydro power exhibit in the Heart's Delight Farm Heritage Exhibit, which will continue in the 2018 exhibit season from May through October.

Closing Comment

If a man said he’ll fix it, he’ll fix it; there’s no need to nag him every 6 months about it.

www.whminer.org
518.846.7121 Office
518.846.8445 Fax