

# Mississippi Beef Cattle Improvement Association

Mississippi Beef Cattle Improvement Association—Productivity and Quality



### Upcoming events:

- **March 3—Hinds CC Bull Test Sale and Mississippi BCIA Spring Bull Sale, Hinds Community College Bull Sale Facility, Raymond, MS**
- March 15—Applied Cattle Nutrition Workshop, MSU
- March 17-19—MSU Artificial Insemination School, Mississippi State, MS
- **April 5 - Cattlemen's Exchange Feeder Calf Board Sale, Winaona, MS**
- April 8—Beef Cattle Boot Camp, Prairie, MS
- April 15—Beef Cattle Boot Camp, Poplarville, MS
- June 1-4—Beef Improvement Federation annual meeting, Bozeman, MT
- September—Beef Cattle Genetics Learn at Lunch sessions

### Inside this issue:

Beef Quality Assurance Meetings	2
Breeding Record Sheets Available	2
Cattle Inventory Estimates	3
MBCIA Membership Application	4
Critical Judgment in Selection	4

## Mississippi BCIA—Hinds Bull Test Sales: March 3

The Hinds Community College Bull Test Sale and MBCIA Spring Bull Sale will feature 51 performance-backed bulls for sale starting at noon on Thursday, March 3, 2011 at the Hinds Community College sale facility in Raymond. Distance bidding sites will be available at the Panola County Extension office in Batesville and the North MS Research and Extension Center in Verona.

Breeds in the 2011 sales include:

- ◆ Angus
- ◆ Charolais
- ◆ Hereford

2011 Consignors include:

- ◆ A. Daughdrill Farms
- ◆ Clear Water Cattle
- ◆ E. L. Farms
- ◆ Harvey Farms
- ◆ Kiani Angus
- ◆ Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station
- ◆ Monogram Farms
- ◆ Southern Shine Pastures
- ◆ Thames Angus Farms
- ◆ Woods Angus
- ◆ Yankee Cutoff Angus Ranch

## MBCIA Launches Advertising Campaign

At the last MBCIA board of directors meeting, a new promotion committee was formed and tasked with developing and implementing an advertising campaign.

The goals of the advertisements will be to:

1. Enhance the image of Mississippi cattle
2. Encourage the purchase of Mississippi cattle
3. Draw attention to the advantages of Mississippi-raised cattle
4. Promote genetic improvement within Mississippi beef cattle herds
5. Promote the adoption of improved management practices on Mississippi beef cattle operations

Look for these advertisements to appear in popular industry publications in the coming months.

### DON'T BUY MYSTERY BULLS



Demand EPDs.

Demand health records.

**Demand Mississippi seedstock.**



[msucare.com/livestock/beef/mbcia](http://msucare.com/livestock/beef/mbcia)



## Updated Cattle Inventory Estimates Released

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) released the January Cattle Inventory Report on February 2, 2011.

- U.S. cattle inventory declined by 1% in 2010
- Mississippi January cattle inventory was down 8% from last year

- All heifers 500 pounds and over at 103,000 head, were down 27 percent
- Beef cow replacement heifers at 71,000 head, were down 23 percent
- Milk cow replacement heifers at 7,000 head, were unchanged

*"...Mississippi cattle inventory fell 8 percent in 2010 to 900,000 head of cattle and calves on January 1, 2011."*

Cattle and Calves: Number of Farms by Classes,  
Mississippi and United States, January 1, 2010-2011

Class	Mississippi			United States		
	2010	2011	Percent of Previous Year	2010	2011	Percent of Previous Year
<b>1,000 Head</b>						
All Cattle and Calves	980	900	92	93,881.2	92,582.4	99
All Cows	520	510	98	40,456.4	40,014.2	99
Beef Cows	503	495	98	31,370.9	30,864.6	98
Milk Cows	17	15	88	9,085.5	9,149.6	101
Heifers 500 Pounds and above	141	103	73	19,745.8	19,532.8	99
Beef Cows Replacements	92	71	77	5,451.0	5,157.6	95
Milk Cow Replacements	7	7	100	4,526.2	4,557.2	101
Other	42	25	60	9,768.6	9,818.0	101
Steers 500 Pounds and above	55	48	87	16,510.4	16,382.0	99
Bulls 500 Pounds and above	39	39	100	2,190.1	2,153.1	98
Calves Under 500 Pounds	225	200	89	14,978.5	14,500.3	97
Calf Crop Entire Year <sup>1</sup>	420	400	95	35,939.0	35,684.8	99

<sup>1</sup> Previous year.

- On January 1, 2011, all cattle and calves in Mississippi totaled 900,000 head; down 8 percent from the previous year
- All cows and heifers that have calved, at 510,000 head, were down 2 percent from the year before
- Beef cows, at 495,000 head, were down 2 percent
- Milk cows, at 15,000 head, were down 12 percent
- Other heifers at 25,000 head, were down 40 percent
- Steers weighing 500 pounds and over at 48,000 head, were down 13 percent
- Bulls weighing 500 pounds and over at 39,000 head, were unchanged
- Calves under 500 pounds at 200,000 head, were down 11 percent
- The 2010 calf crop is estimated at 400,000 head, down 5 percent



The 2010 Mississippi calf crop was down 5% from 2010.

*Mississippi Beef Cattle Improvement  
Association—Productivity and Quality*

Mississippi Beef Cattle Improvement Assn.  
Box 9815  
Mississippi State, MS 39762

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



Send questions or comments to Jane Parish,  
Extension Beef Cattle Specialist,  
Mississippi State University Extension Service

*Jane Parish*

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



**Visit MBCIA online at  
[http://msucares.com/  
livestock/beef/mbcia/](http://msucares.com/livestock/beef/mbcia/)**

## MBCIA Membership Application

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_

County: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

(Check one) Seedstock:  Commercial:

Cattle breed(s): \_\_\_\_\_

*Completed applications and \$5 annual dues or \$100 life-time dues payable to Mississippi BCIA should be mailed to:*

*Mississippi Beef Cattle Improvement Association  
Jane Parish, Extension Beef Cattle Specialist  
Box 9815, Mississippi State, MS 39762*

## Using Critical Judgment in Sire Selection

“Professional sire selection is not going to be done with the same technique and with the same emphasis of traits by every producer in this country, nor in a state or, for that matter, within a rural community. Each producer has his or her own: 1) type of operation (seedstock versus commercial), 2) unique microenvironment to deal with, 3) unique set of economic circumstances, 4) marketing plan, 5) end product customer needs, and 6) unique set of family and operational goals. All of these unique factors call for different methods in defining a product for the marketplace and approaches in genetic selection.

Would one expect a commercial producer selling calves right off the cow to have the same selection goals as a commercial producer retaining ownership all the way to the harvest plant? Would one expect a commercial producer in the desert southwest or in the humid, high rainfall area of the southeast United States to have the same selection goals and methodologies as one in the Corn Belt? In addition, would one expect seedstock producers to have the same selection goals if they are servicing commercial operations with this type of variation?

There are economically relevant traits for all operations and the selection of seedstock for superiority in a trait area can and will impact performance and economic returns within the operation. Keep in mind that for every selection action, there is a performance reaction. While our intention is that this first performance reaction is profitable, we may find some negative performance reactions may occur that may reduce or completely eliminate any economic gain.

For instance, selection for superior growth can lead to increases in mature size and females too large for the forage resources existing on the operation. This in turn leads to either greater supplementation needs or lowered reproductive rates, which potentially have negative connotations to an operational bottom line.

Our only solution to improving the likelihood of moving the operation ahead economically is to incorporate decision-making tools into the selection process, thus reducing judgment errors. With the proliferation of EPD availability, producers will be utilizing economically weighted selection indexes that incorporate many EPD and the economic relationships that exist on their operation.

While we can get completely wrapped up in assessing genetic performance in reproduction, growth, and end product traits, it is imperative that we not forget that beef cattle are a means of harvesting forages and manufacturing co-products for the production of a high-quality protein source for human consumption. This can only be done efficiently if cattle are structurally sound, have longevity, and are easy to handle. The culling of females or bulls early in their lives due to disposition problems, lameness, unsound udders, or other abnormalities is too costly. Critical judgment in this area is important.”

*Excerpt from the Summary Chapter in the Sire Selection Manual. 2nd edition. 2010. National Beef Cattle Evaluation Consortium.*