

Mississippi Beef Cattle Improvement Association

Mississippi Beef Cattle Improvement Association—Productivity and Quality



Upcoming events:

- June 14-16—Making Tracks Leadership Camp, Mississippi Junior Cattle-men's Association, Starkville, MS
- July 25-31—Junior National Hereford Exposition, Tunica, MS
- August 17-18—Cattle Nutrition Short Course, Distance Education sites across Mississippi
- October 12—Bulls arrive at Hinds Community College Bull Test
- October 26—Hinds Community College Bull Test begins

Inside this issue:

Beef Improvement Federation Conference Highlights	5
MBCIA Membership Application	6
BCIA Management Calendar	6

Beef Cattle Short Course Features Nolan Ryan

Over 160 attendees were on hand at the Mississippi Beef Cattle Short Course held on May 21 in Raymond. Speakers from Nolan Ryan Tender Aged Beef, Texas A&M University, Cactus Feeders, and Mississippi State University discussed a wide variety of topics ending with a panel discussion.

If you are interested in receiving a copy of the proceedings from the short course, please contact your local Extension office.



Nolan Ryan taking time to visit with beef producers at the Mississippi Beef Cattle Short Course

Addressing Beef Cow Herd Needs to the Beef Industry Issues and Product Value—A Position Paper

**J. W. Turner, Professor Emeritus
Department of Animal Science,
Texas A&M University, College Station, TX**

The commercial cow-calf operation is now facing greater challenges and economic uncertainty as the beef industry continues to consolidate into production segments with profit centers that focus on an increasing number of traits and issues that impact herd management and breeding decisions. The economic importance of marketing and producer accountability have changed so dramatically that integrated beef production has become a near requirement in some cases for market access. At a minimum, cow-calf producers must consider the acceptability of their cow herd production and too often have little or no knowledge of the true value of their calves to others in the industry. It is realistic to assume that marketing power (value) will drive production concepts. However, market value is too often confused and misrepresented in our segmented industry. This has led to the concept of value-based marketing and the need for integrated production systems that consider all traits and issues affecting value perception in a fair and honest manner for all industry participants. With most beef industry participants

this means a loss of independence in management in some cases and to dictated control by others in other cases. This makes it hard to accept for those with a truly independent attitude about their enterprise. Most often, it is viewed as profitability competition among the segments with a material distrust resulting within the industry. It will be no easy task to develop efficient industry operation with many cow-calf herds owned and operated by part-time cattlemen and with the cattle enterprise a largely secondary aspect to many landowners and agricultural businesses.

Basic Concepts

Beef production and the industry cannot succeed without the basic cow-calf operation as the viable foundation. The cow herd is the renewable resource and the most important segment in capital investment. Low returns (profitability) are accepted by many based on land appreciation and alternative land use. However, future industry emphasis must address the need for survivability of cow-calf enterprises. Essentially every educational effort dictates the need for brood cows to be genetically matched to the production environment. Ritchie (2002) prepared the following table based on BIF (cont. on page 2)



Dr. Bill Turner addressing beef producers at the Mississippi Beef Cattle Short Course

Addressing Beef Cow Herd Needs (Cont.)

guidelines as an illustration.

Table 1. Examples of matching genotype to production environment^a

Restricted feed resources, arid climate
British X British

Medium feed resources, semi-arid climate
British X Smaller, Moderate-Milking Continental

Abundant feed resources, adequate precipitation
British X Larger, Heavier-Milking Continental
Sub-tropical environment
Bos taurus X Bos indicus

^a Based on guidelines of BIF Systems Committee (BIF, 1996)

The problem is many industry leaders in other segments beyond the cowherd ignore the production environment of the cow as an industry concern. I would like to point out that the really important factor is that in every environment crossbred cows are universally needed. Research has consistently identified reproductive, maternal and growth trait heterosis that cannot be ignored in brood cows. I submit that British X Bos indicus cows are advantageous in arid climates with restricted or medium feed resources. Any type of crossbred cow is functional in an environment with abundant feed resources and adequate rainfall. Extreme cold climate disadvantages in winter may limit British X Bos indicus cow acceptance. Sub-tropical climates truly require Bos indicus inheritance in the crossbred cow.

Beef Traits

Balancing the relative importance or emphasis to place on beef production traits has been widely discussed and evaluated. On a broad classification, reproductive traits are most economically important but only limited opportunity exists for direct selection in breeding cattle. Fertility is best managed in any herd by pregnancy testing cows annually and the best genetic predictor is to select crossbred replacement females. Culling open and non-functional cows and maintaining a sound heifer development program insures herd reproductive performance. Bulls should be fertility tested yearly and scrotal circumference used as a threshold trait to ensure early sexual maturity in year-

ling bulls. Use 34 cm at 12 months of age as a reference.

Production traits, maternal and growth, are the most widely available for use in direct selection. However, they are environmentally influenced and we need to rely upon EPD values when available. For cow-calf operations weaning weight is the major trait correlated with economic return. It is not maximum weaning weight but that performance level that is economically viable. Most cow herd efficiency evaluations reflect realistically that the calf weaning weight to mature cow weight at weaning ratio should be about .47. Stated differently, an 1150-pound mature cow at weaning should produce a calf weighing 540 pounds (1150X.47) at 7 months of age. Heavier cows should produce more calf weight while smaller cows produce proportionally less calf weaning weight. Producers must decide if their herd weaning weight average is adequate and economically viable in the environment. Weaning weight is an important cow trait and should be evaluated with percentage calf crop weaned of cows exposed. Cundiff (1987) defined the product value (average weaning weight X percentage calf crop weaned) as a maternal index. I used it in early research reporting as a herd productivity value which measured the actual average calf weight weaned per cow exposed to breeding. It is a true herd efficiency measure but has no application to an individual animal. The actual weaning weight of a calf has some merit in selection for growth but is a dual trait (milk and growth) and other growth traits expressed later in life are most capably used for individual growth selection.

Individual growth evaluation in cattle beyond weaning should rely upon yearling weight or a defined postweaning average daily gain. Cundiff (1987) recommended a lean growth index (Yearling weight- 3.2 X Birth weight) in young beef bulls which stresses heavy yearling weight and credits value to low birth weight. This really stresses early growth and technically aids cowherd management to avoid calving difficulties. Interestingly, the lean growth index also added a negative emphasis on fat thickness at yearling weight or stressed selecting low fatness bulls. This was not widely applied or

"...in every environment crossbred cows are universally needed.."

Addressing Beef Cow Herd Needs (Cont.)

used. Today we see many cattlemen using an implied lean growth index when high yearling weight and low birth weight bulls are selected via EPD values. Such "spread" bulls are valued as industry acceptable. Most commercial cow-calf producers are not aware of postweaning growth performance of their calves since most calves are sold after weaning. It is safe to recommend that crossbred calves be recognized as superior due to growth heterosis. Most industry participants use expected breed differences to predict growth potential. Frame score and muscling score are reported in marketing description as aids to predicted growth. However, there are other factors relative to weight, age, sex and fat condition that greatly influence growth. Cattle buyers use all aspects in value determination but most feel breed composition is the best predictor. It is the easy descriptive terminology accepted. I disagree with judged breed composition as a safe growth predictor because many cannot see or correctly identify the inheritance. What really creates problems are the discrimination aspects of a breed that become major price deductions in value assessment. It is simply not color, shape, muscling or a quality measure that guarantees success. Buyers will use any aspect to discount price paid whether factual or an implied problem. Unknown genetics and beef breed limitations are still largely used by most to establish price. This appears acceptable to many in the industry since breed differences are recognized for product traits like tenderness and marbling and associated with feedlot growth and feed efficiency. Extremely large and small frame cattle are discounted relative to expected slaughter weight. Reduced marbling and tenderness expectations by breed inheritance are too often used. Yield grade is not so much a genetic trait to consider but is a feeding management problem. With mixed breeding load lots being fed, it is easy to blame breed inheritance as the problem. Maybe the buyers and feeders should sort and feed more by breeding potential to acceptable fatness (.35 inches of fatness) and let slaughter weight vary according to cattle breeding merit. Feeders have too often extended feeding time to increase fatness to increase marbling and destroy yield grade. Also cattle

have been fed to heavier weights by increasing fatness, which is improper feeding management. Again in mixed load lots, a lot feeding concept creates more "out" carcasses when cattle have not been sorted or packaged properly before feeding. Variation within a breed is large enough that even purebred cattle will not fit with improper feeding management in load-lot feeding without proper sorting and grouping prior to feeding. Because marbling ability and tenderness are highly heritable traits, many consider genetic control as the major emphasis. I strongly recommend the industry needs to review the USDA beef quality grading system. It is too subjective and does not address maturity in truly youthful cattle. I support research and development of objective and mechanical systems like the CVS-BeefCam that attempts to sort beef carcasses at chain speed for tenderness and yield grade component traits. Those sorted into less desirable groups for tenderness can then be further processed and treated to enhance eating quality. Major emphasis in feeding management must be to minimal fatness for eating quality and optimum lean tissue yield. Feedlot energy efficiency for the beef industry has predicted a 100-day feedlot period as optimum.

With breed differences clearly identified for tenderness and marbling, it is acceptable to many in the industry to justify breeding discrimination as economically accurate. It is not always justified nor accurate but widely used. Without carcass data and progeny records, selection of young breeding animals in any breed for product traits is difficult. Most commercial cattlemen rely upon breed of bull to predict quality grade, yield and eating quality (tenderness). Ritchie (2002) identified three market targets for the beef industry and defined acceptable breed composition to meet each as:

1. *Upscale restaurants and export trade, Mid-Choice and higher grade*

British X British
1/4 Continental X 3/4 British

2. *Retail supermarkets and midscale restaurants, High Select to Low Choice*

1/2 Continental X 1/2 British
1/4 Bos indicus X 3/4 British

(cont. on page 5)

"Without carcass data and progeny records, selection of young breeding animals in any breed for product traits is difficult."



Producers had the opportunity to ask questions to a panel during the beef short course

Addressing Beef Cow Herd Needs (Cont.)



Dr. Turner emphasizes the importance of the brood cow for profitable beef production

3. Young, extremely lean market

- Continental X Continental
- 3/4 Continental X 1/4 British
- 3/4 Continental X 1/4 Bos indicus.

I would recommend the Market 1 should specify $\geq 1/2$ British crossbred. Market 2 cattle should include all crosses except avoid $\geq 75\%$ any Specialty breeds inheritance. Market 3 cattle will require cattle of higher growth potential and larger mature size breeds.

I support the notion that the consuming public mainly fits into the Market 2 classification. With about 50% of all beef consumed as ground beef with reduced fat content preferred, it seems logical to rank Market 3 as next in priority. With young cattle being more widely used in feeding operations, beef carcass maturity is largely A or A minus in the industry, so young cattle are expected in all markets. Certified Angus Beef is represented by Market 1. This very successful program is an excellent example of quality control. However, of all breed qualified (black hide) cattle presented for CAB, only about 15-20% qualifies. This means the majority of all cattle fed and prepared for this market fails and must be assimilated into the other markets, which means more inefficient fat content to address.

The industry carcass target of 70% Choice or above, 70% Yield Grade 1 or 2 and 0% "outs" is an unrealistic goal. Some individual sets of crossbred cattle may meet the target but the normal association between marbling ability (grade) and yield grade make it unrealistic. A well-known genetic antagonism is at play here and selection within a breed cannot guarantee high grade and high lean yield. Fatness management is deemed a more important need and to seek an optimum marbling level. This is certainly more economically important to the industry.

Ritchie (2002) prepared the following table (Table 2), which illustrates the breeding problem for any one-breed type composition:

Table 2. Quality grade and yield grade of various biotypes of fed cattle^a

Biotype	% Choice	%YG1 & 2
100% Continental	30	89

3/4 Continental X 1/4 British	43	83
1/2 Continental X 1/2 British	56	56
1/4 Continental X 3/4 British	66	52
100% British	70	38

^aAdapted from U.S. MARC data.

The MARC and Gelbvieh Alliance general recommendations imply the ideal feedlot cattle should be 50% Continental and 50% British. My early research of feedlot mating type comparisons show that three-breed and backcross cattle are heavier than F-1 and purebred cattle at slaughter due to maternal and growth heterosis advantages carried over from hybrid cows. F-1 cattle were faster gaining in the feedlot but did not compensate for the early weight advantage of calves from crossbred cows.

Historical Industry Management Concepts

The commercial beef industry has been breed oriented since improvement was deemed necessary over native cattle of natural indigenous origin. Selection emphasis has been stressed for heritable traits that are easily measured in life through performance testing. With limited breeds and differences to make rapid industry change, the industry adopted breed importations and creation. Crossbreeding became well documented as advantageous for the cow herd and identified advantages for breed diversity. Management of the cow herd with predictable heterosis over generations then surfaced as an important need. The movement to product marketing and beef product quality and consistency has led to the renewed emphasis on selection for product traits that are difficult and expensive to measure. It is safe to assume that the commercial cattlemen will demand the purebred breeders to perform this task and commercial cattlemen will use breed selection to address beef product merit through bull purchases. It appears we will not abandon crossbreeding at the commercial herd level. Some propose a single dominant beef breed will become the breed of all commercial cattlemen. This is very doubtful as no evidence to date identifies a straight bred sys-

"...three-breed and backcross cattle are heavier than F-1 and purebred cattle at slaughter due to maternal and growth heterosis advantages carried over from hybrid cows."

Addressing Beef Cow Herd Needs (Cont.)

tem as comparable in economic efficiency to controlled crossbreeding for the commercial cattleman. The extensive climate and environmental differences across our nation clearly identify the need to address crossbreeding as required for most commercial beef herds. Certainly evidence exists to stress the need to address beef product quality and consistency but this must be done in holistic management concepts. There is a need to address low-cost production on a brood cow basis in our commercial herds.

Conclusions

It seems important that commercial producers must stress meeting market demands but must select that market that best fits their cow herd genetic potential. Selecting a breed of bull for the market specifications is most important to complement the cow breeding to produce a suitable calf of breeding that can compete. Optimum calf genotype will vary over the different cow herd environments. Neither one breed nor one breed of bull will be an industry standard that meets all needs. It can work in egg laying chickens and dairy cattle where the production environment is essentially controlled. Swine breeds are essentially similar for most production traits except for maternal breed aspects, which demand crossbred genotypes. Because cattle are creatures of forage and climatic environments, the beef industry must balance traits and enhance management to control production limitations without destroying breed diversity and/or limiting the known use of crossbreeding and controlled heterosis in the industry. The need for uniformity and consistency does not

imply only purebred cattle. Crossbred cattle can be equally uniform or actually have less variation in traits influenced by heterosis. Crossbred cattle are intermediates.

Selection and management emphasis must be prioritized in rank order as reproduction, production and product traits for the beef industry. Functional breeding cattle and management ease in the herd will drive acceptance along with low-cost production.

The crossbred cow, a breed composition calf with heterosis in growth traits and sufficient additive inheritance in product traits must be used. Who will make these decisions? Who is responsible for industry accountability to the consumer? How will the industry progress to a more profitable position for all participants? The producers who selects the crossbred cows, chooses the breed of bull and individual breeding cattle based on optimum trait performance for the industry and controls the mating system and management to ensure effective heterosis usage is the responsible person. The consumer, packer, feedlot manager nor order buyer individually can correctly dictate the needed balance of traits for the industry to survive. Each can specify acceptable production and product trait values or what is clearly unacceptable performance that impacts them. We need to think in threshold values and reduce the simplistic breed or breeding answers for the complex industry problems. Source verified, reputation hybrid cattle that combine beef production attributes are the answer. They must be manageable on a herd basis in a defined production environment as a renewable resource. The brood cow is the required base for a profitable beef indus-

“Selection and management emphasis must be prioritized in rank order as reproduction, production and product traits for the beef industry.”

Beef Improvement Federation Conference Highlights

Mississippians, Wayne and L. W. Doler were recently recognized at the Beef Improvement Federation annual meeting as Outstanding Commercial Producer Award Nominees. Several Mississippi producers and Extension agents were on hand for the conference. Speakers talked about everything from the NCBA Carcass Merit Project and the cost of meeting consumer demand to transgenic technology and DNA testing. Animal identifi-

cation, cow herd efficiency, and selection decisions were among the many other topics of discussion. Tours of the South Dakota beef industry explored feedlots, seedstock operations, and reproductive service facilities in the region. Ranch cut and flat iron steaks were also featured at BIF. For proceedings, powerpoint presentations, audio, pictures, and other highlights from the BIF conference visit www.bifconference.com.



MBCIA members Wayne Doler and S. R. Evans at the 2004 BIF Awards luncheon

Mississippi Beef Cattle Improvement Association—Productivity and Quality

Mississippi Beef Cattle Improvement Association
Box 9815
Mississippi State, MS 39762

Phone: 662-325-7466
Fax: 662-325-8873
Email: jparish@ads.msstate.edu



Send questions or comments about this newsletter to Jane Parish, Extension Beef Specialist, Mississippi State University Extension Service

Mississippi State University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation or group affiliation, age, disability,



Visit MBCIA online at
<http://msucares.com/livestock/beef/mbcia/>

MBCIA Membership Application

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____

County: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone Number: _____

(Check one) Seedstock: Commercial:

Cattle breed(s): _____

Completed applications and \$5 annual dues payable to Mississippi BCIA should be mailed to:

Mississippi Beef Cattle Improvement Association
c/o Jane Parish, Extension Beef Specialist
Box 9815, Mississippi State, MS 39762

BCIA Management Calendar—June 2004

GENERAL

Control summer weeds and brush. Allow cool-season annual legumes to reseed. Manage pastures to rotationally graze young growth and harvest excess for hay. Overgrown pastures may need to be clipped. Target the production of high quality hay by harvesting bermudagrass hay at 4-5 week intervals, weather permitting, to keep standing hay crops from becoming too mature and fibrous. Fertilize hay fields between cuttings or on a regular interval to replace soil nutrients removed by hay production and improve hay yield and quality. Record hay yields, forage test each cutting, and develop a hay storage program that will minimize storage losses and allow matching of forage test results with individual lots of hay for use in hay feeding and supplementation decisions. Have proper free-choice minerals and fresh water available for cattle at all times, checking them often. Make sure adequate shade is available for cattle in the summer months. Continue with fly control program, and watch for cancer eye, pinkeye, and foot rot. Maintain a complete herd health program in consultation with a veterinarian including internal and external parasite control and vaccinations. Keep good production and financial records.

SPRING CALVING—January, February, March

Spot check cows and heifers to see if most are bred. Maintain good breeding records including heat detection records, artificial insemination dates, dates bulls turned in and out, identification of herd females and breeding groups, dates bred, returns to heat, and expected calving dates. Remove bulls 283 days prior to the end of the

desired calving season (before June 20 to end the calving season in March). Keep bulls in a small pasture traps with effective fences. Feed bulls to start the next breeding season in good condition. Complete management practices for late calves, and castrate and dehorn any calves missed at birth.

FALL CALVING—October, November, December

Make sure fences where weaned calves will be placed are in good shape, and repair fences where needed. Wean calves based on market and pasture conditions using weaning strategies that minimize calf stress. Record weaning weights and cow body condition scores as measures of animal and herd performance and nutritional status. Calculate and evaluate weaning percentage (calves weaned/cows exposed to breeding) and cow efficiency (calf weight/cow weight). After weaning, cull cows based on pregnancy status, soundness (eyes, udders, feet, legs, teeth), and performance records. Develop plans for marketing cull cows based on market conditions and cow body condition. Select replacement heifers based on performance. Plan a heifer development program based on nutritional resources and gain needed to reach target breeding weights. Explore various calf marketing options to determine what best fits your operation. Prepare for special feeder calf sales. To precondition calves, vaccinate for respiratory diseases (IBR, BVD, PI3, BRSV, and others upon veterinary advise), and wean for at least 45 days before shipment. Train calves to eat from a bunk and drink from a water trough during the preconditioning period. Maintain bulls in small pasture traps with adequate nutrition to be in good body condition at the start of the next breeding season.