Animal and Dairy Science Department
Agriculture Research Building for Animal & Dairy Science - Tifton
http://www.caes.uga.edu/departments/animal-dairy-science/about/newsletters.html

Telephone: (229) 386-3216
Fax: (229) 386-3219

GEORGIA DAIRYFAX

Dear Dairy Producers:

The enclosed information was prepared by the University of Georgia Animal and Dairy Science faculty in Dairy Extension, Research & Teaching. We trust this information will be helpful to dairy farmers and dairy related businesses for continued improvement of the Georgia Dairy Industry.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE: April May June, 2019

Sincerely,

Sha Tao

Sha Tao, Assistant Professor

UGA extension

Herd it Through the Bovine

Youth Corner

Jillian Bohlen, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor and Dairy Extension Specialist

706-542-9108 / jfain@uga.edu

Department of Animal and Dairy Science, UGA

State 4-H Dairy Judging Contest

2019 brought another year of tremendous cattle to the show ring for the State 4-H Dairy Judging Contest. This high quality contest is made possible through the efforts of producers across the Southeast that exhibit animals at the UGA Spring Dairy Show. Four Junior teams (25 youth) and Five senior teams (23 youth) competed for top honors at this year's contest held on April 5th.

The top Junior team was Gordon county with teams members Katie Reynolds, Hunter Petty, Kylie Hurd and Rebekah McElrath. Burke county took home second place in the team competition but had the top junior competitor, Abby Joyner.

In the Senior division, top honors also went to Gordon county with team members Bryson Smith, Gabrielle Ralston, Annelies Carr and Hannah McElrath. Bryson Smith was also high individual for Seniors. This team will represent the state of Georgia at World Dairy Expo this fall at the National 4-H Dairy Judging Competition. The second place Senior team was Carroll county.

Photo*: Winning Junior team from Gordon county*

Photo: *Winning Senior team from Gordon county*

State 4-H Dairy Quiz Bowl Contest

Held June 7th as tribute to June Dairy Month, the State 4-H Dairy Quiz Bowl Contest was the largest of the past few years. With seven Junior teams and six Senior teams, the day was filled with fun competition, lots of dairy knowledge, and good sportsmanship. Winning the Junior competition was the team from Burke county. Team members included Emmaline Cunningham, Tony Gray, Abby Joyner, Alaina Olson and Holt Sapp. Coweta county placed second.

In a final and close match, the team from Coweta county won the Senior Dairy Quiz Bowl Competition. Team members included Jennifer Brinton, Nicole Hillebrand, Kitty Yeager and Madison Dyar. This team will have the opportunity to represent the state of Georgia at the National Dairy Quiz Bowl competition this fall in Louisville, KY. The second place team was from Tift County.

Photo: *Winning Junior team from Burke county*

Photo: *Winning Senior team from Coweta county*

Southeast Dairy Youth Retreat

This year's Southeast Dairy Youth Retreat will be July 7th – 11th in Orange, Virginia. There are 17 youth attending the retreat this year from Georgia. Keep up with retreat happenings at:

https://www.facebook.com/2019SEDYR/

Coming Soon

National 4-H Dairy Conference

Please watch for information regarding applying to serve as a delegate this year to circulate mid to late July. This year's conference is scheduled for September 29th – October 2nd. To get an idea of what happens at the National 4-H Dairy Conference, please review the 2018 schedule found at the website below:

https://national4hdairyconference.org/itinerary/

Management of pinkeye in dairy heifers

Morgan Adkins, DVM, Graduate Student
706-340-7836/ morgana1@uga.edu
and **Brad Heins**, DVM, MFAM, Clinical Assistant Professor
706-542-4312 / bheins@uga.edu
Food Animal Health and Management Program
University of Georgia College of Veterinary Medicine

If you were to ask producers what they feel is the primary disease problem in their replacement herds, many might point a finger at scouring calves or pneumonia. Others may think that an infectious reproductive disease like BVD is keeping them from having higher pregnancy rates. Very few would list pinkeye as a common cause of lost revenue on dairy operations. While it rarely causes death, pinkeye is associated with pain, reduced feed intake, and blindness in cattle. With losses in average daily gain due to a case of pinkeye estimated at 20-40 lbs, animal performance suffers greatly from just a single case.

Causes

The primary bacterial cause of pinkeye or keratoconjunctivitis, in cattle are bacteria known as *Moraxella bovis* and *Moraxella bovoculi*. These bacteria may live on both normal healthy animals and those found with the disease, indicating that there are other factors that may influence the risk of disease. As summer progresses, grazing cattle are confronted with increasing numbers of face flies, decreasing forage quality, increased heat and sunlight exposure, and crowding into shaded pasture areas. Mature grass and poor quality hay cause significant irritation to the surface of the eye, and allow opportunity for the bacteria to colonize. Animals lacking pigment around the eye are commonly affected as the UV light from the sun leads to sensitization and inflammation of the cornea and conjunctiva. Other pathogens such as Infectious Bovine Rhinotracheitis virus (IBR), *Mycoplasma, Chlamydia,* or *Acholeplasma* species of bacteria may cause enough irritation to lead to secondary infection. The most common vectors or carriers for *Moraxella bovis* are the face fly (*Musca autumnalis*), the house fly (*Musca domestica*), and the stable fly (*Stomoxys calcitrans*). These fly species not only carry the bacteria, but also serve as a source of irritation on their own. These factors all add up to create the ideal environment for a livestock to suffer from pinkeye infection.

Clinical Signs

Perhaps one of the most frustrating parts of this disease is not knowing if or when a herd will be affected. Even if a herd has been free of it for years, flies may come from a neighboring pasture carrying new strains of the organisms and cause an outbreak of the disease. As immunity to the organisms often appears to develop in older cattle, it is usually the young, growing calves and replacement animals who are most affected by the disease. Although not truly seasonal, pinkeye most commonly occurs from late spring to early fall but may also be seen in the winter.

The initial signs of pinkeye will be excessive tearing, sensitivity to light, and redness on the white portions of the eye. Animals may seek shaded areas to minimize stress from sunlight. A small, white spot called an ulcer may appear on the globe of the eye and the cornea may appear cloudy due to inflammation. As the disease progresses, the eye may appear more inflamed with

increasing redness, more cloudy as it is filled with white blood cells, or may completely ulcerate and prolapse, releasing the contents of the eye to the external environment, causing extreme pain and blindness. Blood vessels may begin to grow across the eye, indicating the eye is trying to heal by providing additional blood flow and nutrients. Once the animal develops immunity and the active infection ceases, the eye will usually heal, leaving an inactive, blue-white scar on the cornea or in severe cases, permanent damage to the eye and blindness will occur.

Treatment

Early identification and treatment of these calves is important to minimize the negative effects on growth and development as well as prevention of blindness in those with the disease. Several treatment options including long acting antibiotics, eye patches, and surgical care are available and should be discussed with your herd veterinarian as part of your herd treatment plan. If antibiotics are used, a record of treatment should be created and appropriate withdrawal times should be observed.

Prevention

While not a guarantee, several management steps may be beneficial in preventing an outbreak of pinkeye. The use of fly tags is common, but care should be taken to appropriately rotate the tags so resistance does not occur. There are currently three different types of fly tags available: 1) Organophosphate tags which should never be used in lactating dairy animals, 2) Pyrethrin or Synergized Pyrethrin tags, which may be used in lactating dairy animals, and 3) Abamectin tags, which also may be used in lactating animals. Current recommendations are to rotate the chemical class of fly tag each year to avoid the development of resistance of flies to the chemicals present in the tag. Additionally, new combination tags have become common in the market which contain two or more classes of chemical targeting flies. These tags, while usually effective, do speed the rate of fly tag resistance due to dual chemical exposure. Tags should always be placed according to label directions and should be removed as soon as the major fly season has ended to avoid exposing flies to lower doses of insecticide. In addition to tags, pour-on insecticides or back rubbers may be used for additional treatment of external parasites. Insect growth regulators may help with decreasing the generational development in the fly populations. Gloves should be worn when applying the products to minimize the dose one may receive from handling the tags during application. An additional benefit to better fly control may be the reduction of mastitis in first lactation animals, which is often a result of horn flies biting the teat ends and spreading *Staph. aureus* bacteria.

Many of these flies lay their eggs or shelter in either manure pats or in decaying plant material around the farm. It is important to avoid the buildup of either of these products in or around the pastures as this significantly increases fly numbers. Care should be taken when choosing dewormers as some may also kill dung beetles which are responsible for reducing a large proportion of the fly population by breaking up and drying manure pats. For animals in close confinement, the use of fly predators has been shown to be beneficial in some cases to reduce the number of external parasites present.

Appropriate clipping of mature pastures may reduce the amount of irritation to the animals during grazing and rolling out of round bales will ensure that animals are not eating into a bale and receiving irritation from the hay. As grass or hay becomes mature, it is more likely to irritate the eye as the animal eats and releases more dust into the environment, also causing irritation. Appropriate weed control is also an important management factor as weeds contribute pollen and

mature plants that may irritate the animals during grazing. Maintaining good nutritional support will also prove to be beneficial as it promotes a healthy immune system and helps prevent disease.

Providing shade through physical structures or trees may help to minimize the impact of ultraviolet light.

Several commercial vaccines have been developed for *Moraxella bovis*, but have shown variable efficacy due to the number of strains of the *Moraxella bovis* bacteria. Additionally, a conditionally licensed bacterin for *Moraxella bovoculi* is beginning to receive some utilization to aid in disease prevention. If the disease becomes severe, an autogenous vaccine may be created against either the *Moraxella bovis* or *Moraxella bovoculi* for the strain on your farm with the help of your veterinarian. Additionally, regular vaccination against IBR and BVD will help maintain a high level of immunity to organisms that may predispose the animal to infection. With this in mind, one should remember that modified live vaccines (MLV) are designed to simulate actual disease and as such, may predispose animals to infection with *Moraxella* species. If possible, vaccines should be given when the animals are not stressed, at least two weeks prior to transport, and well before the start of fly season to minimize any effect of vaccination. When treating animals, care should be taken not to spread the disease between affected and unaffected animals. Latex or nitrile gloves should be worn and removed between each animal to prevent further spread of the bacteria.

Summary

While it may be difficult to implement all of these management strategies, particularly in a small herd, it is important to note that any steps taken not only benefit by helping to reduce disease, but also improve the overall health and nutrition of the herd. As the herd health improves, production usually follows, providing not only monetary satisfaction, but also knowing that you are doing a better job managing your cattle on a regular basis.

Do you look at your records?

Lane O. Ely, Ph.D.,

Professor Emeritus

laneely@uga.edu

Department of Animal and Dairy Science, UGA

A dairy farm can generate a lot of numbers for the owner, manager, employees or consultant to use. These numbers are only useful in decision making if they are used. There are different programs that will collect, store, and summarize these values. Do you use your numbers or do they sit in a report?

Following are a couple of examples where numbers led to questions or helped to solve problems.

I recently worked with a large herd that had excellent milk production values. The pens were large (300+ cows). The cows were milked 3 times a day and had automatic milk recording. The pens milk production was excellent, over 100 pounds per cow per day. For an experiment, daily individual cow milk weights by pen were recorded and evaluate. Remember that the pen's daily milk production was over 100 pounds of milk per cow per day.

Examining the individual milk weights, one noticed that there were cows with '0' milk weights, cows with '90+' milk weights, and cows with blank milk weights. All were not what was expected. These can be explained as a cow identification problem. If the milking parlor is 4 stalls, then there should be 4 cows identified and each cow will have a milk weight but if there is a misidentification then the milk weights will be wrong. If the id is at the start of the stalls, each cow will be identified and assigned a stall. The first cow through is in the first stall, the second cow ided and assigned the second stall and continue until the stalls are filled. Each cow will then have a milk weight for that milking. But if the first cow is ided and is assigned the first stall and for some reason she backs up and is ided a second time, she is also also assigned the second stall. The second cow is assigned the third stall, the third cow is assigned the fourth stall and the fourth cow is assigned no stall. The result is the first cow gets the recorded milk weight of both herself and the second stall. The value is now the very high milk weight. The second cow gets the third stall weight and the third cow gets the fourth stall weight and the fourth cow gets the '0' weight. The individual cow's weights are off. This could be checked by the milkers to make sure the right cow is identified in the stall.

The second observation of the individual milkings was the cows would have a milk weight of less than a couple of pounds. For example, a cow would have milk weights of 43.6, 1.1, and 49.7 for the three milkings that day. This indicates that the cow was ided, the unit was attached and then fell and no one reattached it. This is a problem in the milking procedure.

The managers were looking at the pen averages and these looked good. I was interested in the individual cow milk weights and these problems jumped out. It pays to look beyond your normal values of reference every now and then to see if everything lines up.

Another herd had suffered a loss of milk production over time. The herd had gone from 80 pounds per cow per day to 50 pounds per cow per day. This drop had occurred in a 3 month period and continued for the past year with little change. Talking to the manager, he felt that the problem was due to a lot of late lactation cows. He was correct that there were a lot of late lactation cows.

Due to a variety of problems almost 60% of the cows were 250 or more days in milk. Looking at the records that was not the total reason milk production was low. The late lactation cows were averaging 45 pounds per day but the 30% of the herd with 100 DIM or less were only averaging 58 pounds. Not only was their average low but their peak milk was only 70 pounds and the drop off was very quick. The other value that jumped out was the MUN value was averaging 8.9. From this data, there seemed to be a potential for a nutrition problem.

Discussing the ration with the manager, a ration balanced for 80 pounds of milk was being fed and consumed at 56 pounds of dry matter intake. This did not seem possible as the herd's BCS was in the 3.5 to 3.75 range. With that ration, intake and milk production, the facts did not line up. After more discussion and observations, this ration was the calculated ration. The question becomes what is being mixed and fed and what is being eaten. The answer turned out that none of this information was available. So with some observation, it developed that the ration being mixed was not consistent with the calculated ration. Also the amount fed varied from feeding to feeding. The bunks were being filled up so it looked like a full feed but no weight-backs were being done as the bunks were not being cleaned out. The bottom half of the bunks were full of warm molding feeds causing spoilage of the fresh feed. The bottom line was the cows were milking what there were being fed not what it was calculated for.

Again look beyond the big value to see the whole picture. This example also points out that not collecting data can be just as troublesome as not using the values that you have.

Biosecurity and personnel training in dairy farms

Pedro Melendez, DVM, MS, Ph.D.

pedro.melendez@uga.edu/573-825-6160

Department of Population Health | UGA College of Veterinary Medicine

Clinical Associate Professor & Field Service Investigator Bovine Production Medicine

43 Brighton Rd, Tifton, GA 31793

Biosecurity in animal production has become increasingly important, since the efficiency in different areas of the agricultural sector, such as animal health, food safety, environment and animal welfare depend on the correct implementation of a biosafety protocol. Biosecurity refers to all those measures or management practices that contribute to avoid the introduction and dissemination of pathogens in a production system. Biosecurity procedures fluctuate considerably within the different production systems, a fact that is more evident in bovine production systems with low intensification, when compared to that observed in intensive systems such as poultry and swine industry whose biosecurity management is more advanced. This weakness makes biosecurity approaches in livestock to be associated with undesirable outcomes such as diseases, animal welfare concerns, increased mortality and low productivity, which in turn translates into a decrease in profitability.

For producers, biosecurity measures may or may not be relevant, and this depends on their knowledge and interest in the subject. However, the ability to understand the problem, risks, and potential effects of mismanagement is what influences attitudes and actions toward animal health and biosecurity. Therefore, it is important the producers' opinion about biosecurity, what it means for them, what they relate to it and what measures they consider useful or not in order to maintain or improve the level of biosafety. This can contribute to the rectification of those errors or shortcomings that negatively affect biosecurity, since to achieve a change at the farm level it is first necessary to make a personal change in the individuals linked to the productive system. In this scenario, veterinarians should fulfill their role of advising and training producers in this area.

In several dairy farms, perception of biosecurity is far from satisfactory, since most of personnel do not know what biosecurity means and for those who had some idea, made it difficult for them to speak about the subject without mentioning other terms such as facilities, environment and animal welfare, which are related to the subject, but are not part of its definition.

Workers' attitude towards biosecurity concepts is positive, considering that the measures of a biosecurity plan are useful and beneficial for the farms. In general, all biosecurity measures considered important by workers can be easily implemented in farms. Within these, the most frequent biosecurity measures are "pest control", "management of dead animals away from main facilities", "animals without contact with those of other neighbors" and "no reuse of disposable sanitary items". On the other hand, biosecurity measures carried out more infrequently are "the use of special clothing to handle animals with infectious diseases or of unknown cause" and the "location of the visitor parking lot away from the main facilities".

Despite the good attitude and excellent conduct, some inconsistencies are observed. Owners and workers consider that most of the biosecurity measures are useful and important and, despite this, the level of compliance of some of these measures are low. These inconsistencies could be

due to a subject of knowledge, and financial concerns, which is the most important reason in decision making, as it may have been considered costly to make improvements in this area.

It is important to emphasize that changes in biosecurity issues in general do not require large investments, so they are improvements that every dairy could do. Its implementation depends on the understanding of the importance and benefits that lie within them. The information will be fundamental to achieve these changes, since an idea based on good bases allows a better understanding, which will be more powerful and lasting in time. In this view, veterinarians should have an active role, because they are seen as the most used and preferred source of information by the workers and managers. This makes clear the important role they play, for which they must be prepared, informed and updated, and reach the expectations that the farms have of them. Consequently, training programs should be a recurrent mechanism for transmitting knowledge, attitudes and good practices in dairies. Conducting a general training must be focused to each particular farm, so that, to become effective, a specific training should be addressed towards the actual problems the farm has. This will allow you to use the knowledge delivered beforehand and focus on what the dairy needs and therefore will make it easier to internalize and give meaning to everything said in a general training.

In addition to this, it is advisable to provide a manual or Standard Operating Protocols (SOP) with all the written information, as it will serve as support material to the already explained and as a source of fast and reliable information to solve future concerns. As a general recommendation, training should be performed on all members of a dairy's work team, since management must be comprehensive. This situation needs to be clarified and well understood by each of the personnel, since, biosecurity is an issue that is up to all members of a dairy and achieving success is in the hands of all.

Because many dairy workers in the US are native from Spanish speaking countries and have a minimal level of English command, the University of Georgia offers a series of training programs in Spanish in different technical areas such as milking schools, calf management, hoof-trimming, postpartum cow management, etc. All these trainings have a strong component in the understanding of the importance of biosecurity concepts. In the following table a summary of each training module is shown.

Table: *Training Modules for Spanish-Speaking Workers*

Module	Topic
1	**Module: Transition Dairy Cow Management** - Management of the prepartum period - Calving management - Looking for sick cows - Postpartum health monitoring program
2	**Module: Mastitis/Milking School** - General concepts of bovine mastitis - Somatic Cell Counts and Bacteria Count - Diagnosis, Control and Prevention of mastitis - Evaluation of udder and teat score - Proper milking procedures
3	**Module: Lameness/Hoof Trimming** - Gross anatomy and functioning of the claw/hoof - Significant infectious and non-infectious claw diseases - Lameness score - Hoof trimming techniques
4	**Module: Reproduction/Breeding School** - Advances on bovine estrus cycle - Estrous detection - Estrus synchronization and TAI - AI techniques - Reproductive diseases and treatment
5	**Module: Calves** - Colostrum management - Common diseases of calves - Evaluation of total proteins - Evaluation of colostrum quality - Oral tubing and IV injections - Dehorning techniques

Is your heat abatement system working properly?

John K. Bernard, Ph.D., P.A.S., Dipl. ACAN

jbernard@uga.edu / 229-391-6856

Dairy Nutrition and Management

Animal and Dairy Science - Tifton

Providing evaporative cooling is essential for reducing the heat load on cows and calves. While most producers have installed cooling systems for lactating cows, supplemental cooling isn't always provided for dry cows, calves and replacement heifers. To evaluate how much heat stress different groups of animals are experiencing, observe the following items:

Milk yield: Declines in intake and milk yield are well documented. The decline in milk yield is related to the degree of heat stress. The majority of the Southeast experiences chronic heat stress where temperatures rarely decrease below 68°F to provide any relief. Declines in milk fat are also observed which are related to changes in eating behavior, decline in natural buffering due to saliva loss, and changes in ruminal fermentation do to heat stress.

Body temperature: The normal body temperature of a dairy cow or calf is 101.5 °F. Body temperatures above 103 °F indicate heat stress and above 104 °F indicate severe heat stress. Concurrent with increased body temperature, respiration rate will increase.

Respiration rate: The normal respiration rate of a dairy cows is less than 40 breathes per minute. To evaluate heat stress, record the respiration rate of 10 cows. A respiration rate is greater than 75 breaths per minute for seven cows indicates that the cows are experiencing heat stress. If more than 5 cows display open mouth breathing and or respiration rates greater than 100 per minute suggest severe heat stress and requires to reduce heat stress. For calves the normal respiration rate is less than 30 breathes per minute. Calves and replacement heifers under heat stress have increased respiration rates, but the values are not as well defines as those for cows; however, if the respiration rate doubles (60 or more breathes per minute) then the heifer is experiencing heat stress. While heifers are generally considered to handle heat stress better than lactating cows, body weight gain will be lower.

Activity and behavior: Animals experiencing heat stress tend to stand rather than lay down. In freestall barn, cows will stand under the soaker along the feed bunk rather than lay down in the freestall. Cows also tend to gather around the water trough. Animals in pastures that are experiencing heat stress will seek shade rather than graze or eat at the feed bunk during the day.

If you observe any of these symptoms, evaluate your heat abatement system. Is there adequate shade and natural air flow for animals housed outside? Are the fans clean and moving adequate volumes of air? Is there anything blocking fresh air flow into your barn? Is your soaker or mister operating as designed? Does your barn's ridge vent facilitate removal of hot air to reduce the heat load? Is radiant heat from the roof adding to the heat load of the cows? Is there adequate drink water and space available for cows?

If heat stress abatement is not ideal, now is the time to make adjustments to minimize the impact during the remainder of the summer.

Looking inward for perspective on reproduction

Jillian Bohlen, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor and Dairy Extension Specialist
706-542-9108 / jfain@uga.edu
Department of Animal and Dairy Science, UGA

A little over a year ago, the UGA Teaching Dairy was behind, reproductively speaking. Cows were hitting an all time high for average days in milk and heifers were older than usual at first calving. Something needed to be done and it needed to be done quickly. Reproductive efficiency, especially in the average milk producing herd, is imperative for financial stability. In order to get a grasp on what was happening, we took three significant steps.

Step 1: **Find** holes in the current reproductive program

Step 2: **Stop** what leaks you can immediately

Step 3: **Plan** for a long -term solution

Step 1 was to **find** what holes were currently causing our reproductive efficiency to seep away. For analysis, we focused on the records. We evaluated conception by technician, bull, breeding trigger, lactation number, and service number. We then looked at pregnancy rate. Given how big our problem was, we assumed that this simplistic approach would yield an answer. Our answer was that our problem was two fold – failure to enroll/inseminate cows in a timely manner and poor overall conception rates. With problem one, days to first service was closing in on 100 DIM and breeding intervals were almost consistently 48+ days despite using resources for heat detection and scheduling pregnancy checks at 28-32 days post insemination. Conception risk appeared to be across the board problematic, which led to an initial belief that it was inseminator driven more than any other variable. A final worthwhile note is that in this scavenger hunt of the records, we did identify one bull that we used on 42 breedings over two years that only resulted in 2 pregnancies. Though not our main driver of reproductive inefficiency, this finding is useful.

Step 2 was to **stop** the leaks we could immediately. The immediate issue we sought to resolve was the low conception rate. Our determination of how to stop this leak was based on evaluation of the semen, the cows, the breeding program, and the people.

Semen Evaluation: Five straws of semen were thawed and evaluated from bulls that were received at various points in time over the past year. This was to assess viability and if viability was an issue attempt to determine if it was related to time of receipt. No issues in semen viability were found.

Cow Evaluation – with a herd our size, we were able to do a reproductive "audit". For this audit, we physically evaluated overall cow condition (hoof, BCS, etc.) and reproductive tract condition (infection, cysts, etc.) on open cows. We did identify a small portion of cows (less than 10%) that were suffering from follicular cysts, state of anestrus, or endometritis. Some of these animals were put on tailored reproductive programs while others were designated culls.

Breeding Program Evaluation – based on a short recap of shot schedules for the timed artificial insemination program (TAI – Ovsynch) we felt like the program was set correctly but shot adherence could use marginal improvement. Shots were not administered to the TAI group at a unified time. Though not as critical on the initial setup shots, we did make the change that all

animals would move to headlocks for their second GnRH injection at the designated time.

People Evaluation – based on only small leaks determined in all other evaluation areas, we had to assume there was a need for retraining of people. While long-term solutions were planned and implemented, we designated new primary AI technicians. At this time, we also coupled in previous notations regarding inaccurate heat detection. These inaccuracies were noted over the previous year as animals confirmed pregnant were identified as "in heat". For the short term, we suspended breeding based on suspected heats acknowledging the risk of reinsemination of pregnant animals before or after pregnancy determination.

Step 3 was to **plan** for long-term solutions. To begin the process, technicians were retrained on semen handling and insemination technique. The heifers, we realized really needed a TAI program. The labor involved in accurately heat detecting this group is not a realistic option at this time. The program we've employed is a slightly modified 5-day Cosynch, outlined in Figure 1 below. This program has worked tremendously well using conventional semen with consistent conception rates at 65%+.

Heifer Modified 5-Day Cosynch

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
			9:00:00 AM CIDR In & GnRH			

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	4:30 PM CIDR Out & PGF	4:30 PM PGF		10:30 AM TAI and GnRH		

Figure 1*: Schedule for TAI in heifers.*

We really needed to play catch up on some cows (long DIM) while setting up our early lactation cows for the highest first service conception risk scenario. For this reason, based on stage of lactation and reproductive health (Table 1), we setup three strategic breeding programs for the cows (Figure 2).

Table 1: *Breeding program and animal assignment criteria*

Program	Animals
Ovsynch-56	Animals over 100 DIM
Ovsynch-56 + CIDR	Animals with 3+ services and open or determined anestrus at the reproductive audit
Double Ovsynch	All animals 45-100 DIM

Ovsynch w or w/o CIDR						
Sunday	**Monday**	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**	**Saturday**
	9:00 AM GnRH (w or w/o CIDR)					

Sunday	**Monday**	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**	**Saturday**
	9:00 AM PGF (pull any CIDRs)		5:00 PM GnRH	9:00 AM TAI		

Double Ovsynch						
Sunday	**Monday**	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**	**Saturday**
					9:00 AM GnRH	
Sunday	**Monday**	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**	**Saturday**
					9:00 AM PGF	
Sunday	**Monday**	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**	**Saturday**
	9:00 AM GnRH					
Sunday	**Monday**	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**	**Saturday**
	9:00 AM GnRH					
Sunday	**Monday**	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**	**Saturday**
	9:00 AM PGF		5:00 PM GnRH	9:00 AM TAI		

Figure 2*: Schedules for TAI in cows*

Gradually, we enrolled small batches on these programs until little by little we started to catch up. Now we are at the point where cows are automatically reenrolled following an open pregnancy check and all cows at 55 DIM are automatically enrolled in Ovsynch. Pregnancy checks are performed at 28-35 days post insemination to maximize likelihood of a corpus luteum at reenrollment, which data shows improves conception rates to the ovsynch program.

With the summer heat we are going to use TAI on all cows unless a cow is cherry picked off a program. For now, given our success with Ovsynch we are suspending the use of double ovsynch as our protocol adherence is much higher with only a single protocol employed in the lactating cow herd. Animals are still administered a CIDR if they are considered anestrus or if they do not have a CL at the time of program reenrollment. The heifer and cow programs are strategically designed to remove weekend shots and designate a singular day in the week for breeding.

This plan has us on a running continuum that will hopefully prevent us from going back to the spot we were one year ago. To make the herd more financially viable, the process above was coupled with strategic culling of animals that were long DIM and within 10-15 pounds of

breakeven milk. Though not the ideal situation, this is the epitome of real world learning for our students. As I tell them, we must always be learning from our state of life whether we're high on the mountain or deep in the valley. Students that were a part of classes, working on the farms, or just stopping by the office to chat were often part of this investigative and brainstorming process. This kind of education, taking knowledge from the classroom and applying it to a real world problem is second to none.

The final action item was in regards to that bull, the bull that that only produced two pregnancies after 42 breedings. He now serves as a good teaching tool as well. He's now officially retired from servicing any UGA cows but serves as a really nice tool for semen evaluation in class!

Important Dates

2019-2020

Corn Silage and Forage Field day

- June 20, 2019, beginning at 8 am.
- UGA Tifton Campus Conference Center
- Featured speaker: Dr. Limin Kung, University of Delaware, will discuss the best management practices for making silage.

Georgia National Fair

- October 3-13, 2019
- 401 Larry Walker Parkway, Perry, GA
- https://www.georgianationalfair.com/

Sunbelt Agriculture Expo

- October 15-17, 2019
- 290-G Harper Boulevard, Moultrie, GA 31788-2157
- http://sunbeltexpo.com/

Georgia Dairy Conference

- January 20-22, 2020
- Savannah Marriott Riverfront, 100 General McIntosh Boulevard, Savannah, GA 31401
- http://www.gadairyconference.com/

UGA extension

Top GA DHIA By Test Day Milk Production – March 2019										
					Test Day Average				Yearly Average	
Herd	County	Br.	Test Date	[1]Cows	% in Milk	Milk	% Fat	TD Fat	Milk	Lbs. Fat
DAVE CLARK*	Morgan	H	3/4/2019	1164	90	97.1	4.2	3.73	30827	1267
RODGERS' HILLCREST FARMS INC.*	McDuffie	H	3/6/2019	443	88	95.8	4.2	3.54	31396	1210
A & J DAIRY*	Wilkes	H	3/28/2019	423	91	90.6			28232	
TROY YODER	Macon	H	2/27/2019	296	88	88.8	3.8	2.88	25457	1018
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	H	3/7/2019	285	91	88	3.9	3.18	28568	1115
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	H	3/5/2019	738	90	86.5	3.3	2.71	26831	954
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	H	3/26/2019	422	88	85.3	3.5	2.73	25811	889
J.EVERETT WILLIAMS*	Morgan	X	3/11/2019	2014	88	85.3	4.2	3.16	27324	1194
PHIL HARVEY #2	Putnam	H	3/21/2019	1505	88	84.9	3.7	2.78	24945	948
IRVIN R YODER	Macon	H	2/26/2019	230	89	81.6	3.6	2.77	24089	915
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	H	3/20/2019	177	88	81.3	4	2.83	25849	1009
BRENNEMAN FARMS	Macon	H	3/14/2019	50	82	80	3	2.32	19386	696
COASTAL PLAIN EXP STATION*	Tift	H	3/21/2019	252	90	79.7	3.8	2.8	24356	897
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	H	3/18/2019	1028	90	79.7	3.9	2.85	25523	937
SOUTHERN SANDS FARM	Burke	H	3/25/2019	93	90	78	3.6	2.56	24132	890
TWIN OAKS FARM	Jefferson	H	3/14/2019	69	90	77.6	3.8	2.7	22492	868
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	H	2/27/2019	325	89	76.7	4.3	3.14	23442	940
VISSCHER DAIRY LLC*	Jefferson	H	2/25/2019	1025	88	75.8	3.7	2.55	22824	803
R & D DAIRY	Lamar	H	2/21/2019	301	92	74.9	3.9	2.79	24523	990
WHITEHOUSE FARM	Macon	H	2/28/2019	241	89	74.4	3.8	2.57	22580	843

[1]Minimum herd or permanent string size of 20 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).

UGA extension

Top GA DHIA By Test Day Fat Production – March 2019										
					Test Day Average				Yearly Average	
Herd	County	Br.	Test Date	[1]Cows	% in Milk	Milk	% Fat	TD Fat	Milk	Lbs. Fat
DAVE CLARK*	Morgan	H	3/4/2019	1164	90	97.1	4.2	3.73	30827	1267
RODGERS' HILLCREST FARMS INC.*	McDuffie	H	3/6/2019	443	88	95.8	4.2	3.54	31396	1210
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	H	3/7/2019	285	91	88	3.9	3.18	28568	1115
J.EVERETT WILLIAMS*	Morgan	X	3/11/2019	2014	88	85.3	4.2	3.16	27324	1194
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	H	2/27/2019	325	89	76.7	4.3	3.14	23442	940
TROY YODER	Macon	H	2/27/2019	296	88	88.8	3.8	2.88	25457	1018
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	H	3/18/2019	1028	90	79.7	3.9	2.85	25523	937
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	H	3/20/2019	177	88	81.3	4	2.83	25849	1009
BOB MOORE	Putnam	H	3/5/2019	189	89	70.2	4.1	2.81	19838	793
COASTAL PLAIN EXP STATION*	Tift	H	3/21/2019	252	90	79.7	3.8	2.8	24356	897
R & D DAIRY	Lamar	H	2/21/2019	301	92	74.9	3.9	2.79	24523	990
PHIL HARVEY #2	Putnam	H	3/21/2019	1505	88	84.9	3.7	2.78	24945	948
IRVIN R YODER	Macon	H	2/26/2019	230	89	81.6	3.6	2.77	24089	915
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	H	3/26/2019	422	88	85.3	3.5	2.73	25811	889
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	H	3/5/2019	738	90	86.5	3.3	2.71	26831	954
TWIN OAKS FARM	Jefferson	H	3/14/2019	69	90	77.6	3.8	2.7	22492	868
OCMULGEE DAIRY	Houston	H	3/27/2019	331	87	73.7	3.8	2.59	21843	799
WHITEHOUSE FARM	Macon	H	2/28/2019	241	89	74.4	3.8	2.57	22580	843
SOUTHERN SANDS FARM	Burke	H	3/25/2019	93	90	78	3.6	2.56	24132	890
VISSCHER DAIRY LLC*	Jefferson	H	2/25/2019	1025	88	75.8	3.7	2.55	22824	803

[1]Minimum herd or permanent string size of 20 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).

UGA extension

Top GA DHIA By Test Day Milk Production – April 2019										
					Test Day Average				Yearly Average	
Herd	County	Br.	Test date	[1]Cows	% in Milk	Milk	% Fat	TD Fat	Milk	Lbs. Fat
DAVE CLARK*	Morgan	H	4/8/2019	1189	89	96.1	4.2	3.67	30706	1263
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	H	4/1/2019	728	91	91.4	3.5	3.03	26907	954
A & J DAIRY*	Wilkes	H	4/26/2019	429	91	90			28299	
IRVIN R YODER	Macon	H	4/6/2019	223	89	86.9	3.4	2.77	24385	918
TROY YODER	Macon	H	3/31/2019	302	88	86.9	3.7	2.77	25728	1023
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	H	4/10/2019	291	91	86.8	3.9	3.13	28598	1113
J.EVERETT WILLIAMS*	Morgan	X	4/15/2019	2027	88	86.7	4.1	3.14	27216	1186
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	H	3/26/2019	422	88	85.3	3.5	2.73	25811	889
PHIL HARVEY #2	Putnam	H	3/21/2019	1505	88	84.9	3.7	2.78	24945	948
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	H	3/20/2019	177	88	81.3	4	2.83	25849	1009
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	H	4/22/2019	1009	90	79	3.8	2.79	25384	940
SOUTHERN SANDS FARM	Burke	H	3/25/2019	93	90	78	3.6	2.56	24132	890
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	H	3/29/2019	322	89	77.8	4.1	3	23398	944
RUFUS YODER JR	Macon	H	3/15/2019	157	92	74.2	3.5	2.46	21635	810
OCMULGEE DAIRY	Houston	H	3/27/2019	331	87	73.7	3.8	2.59	21843	799
WHITEHOUSE FARM	Macon	H	4/4/2019	243	90	73.7	3.7	2.54	22556	848
VISSCHER DAIRY LLC*	Jefferson	H	4/3/2019	1028	88	72.8	3.7	2.4	22621	803
WALNUT BRANCH FARM	Washington	H	3/27/2019	500	86	72.5	3.7	2.45	18662	717
BRENNEMAN FARMS	Macon	H	4/22/2019	50	82	71.4	3.6	2.59	19566	693
BOB MOORE	Putnam	H	4/5/2019	186	89	70.2	3.8	2.62	19804	794

[1]***Minimum herd or permanent string size of 20 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).***

Top GA DHIA By Test Day Fat Production - April 2019										
					Test Day Average				Yearly Average	
Herd	County	Br.	Test Date	[1]Cows	% in Milk	Milk	% Fat	TD Fat	Milk	Lbs. Fat
DAVE CLARK*	Morgan	H	4/8/2019	1189	89	96.1	4.2	3.67	30706	1263
J.EVERETT WILLIAMS*	Morgan	X	4/15/2019	2027	88	86.7	4.1	3.14	27216	1186
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	H	4/10/2019	291	91	86.8	3.9	3.13	28598	1113
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	H	4/1/2019	728	91	91.4	3.5	3.03	26907	954
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	H	3/29/2019	322	89	77.8	4.1	3	23398	944
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	H	3/20/2019	177	88	81.3	4	2.83	25849	1009
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	H	4/22/2019	1009	90	79	3.8	2.79	25384	940
PHIL HARVEY #2	Putnam	H	3/21/2019	1505	88	84.9	3.7	2.78	24945	948
IRVIN R YODER	Macon	H	4/6/2019	223	89	86.9	3.4	2.77	24385	918
TROY YODER	Macon	H	3/31/2019	302	88	86.9	3.7	2.77	25728	1023
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	H	3/26/2019	422	88	85.3	3.5	2.73	25811	889
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	J	4/18/2019	32	83	58.6	4.9	2.67	17175	847
BOB MOORE	Putnam	H	4/5/2019	186	89	70.2	3.8	2.62	19804	794
BRENNEMAN FARMS	Macon	H	4/22/2019	50	82	71.4	3.6	2.59	19566	693
OCMULGEE DAIRY	Houston	H	3/27/2019	331	87	73.7	3.8	2.59	21843	799
JOHN WESTSTEYN*	Bacon	X	4/4/2019	1366	90	68.9	4	2.57	19675	803
SOUTHERN SANDS FARM	Burke	H	3/25/2019	93	90	78	3.6	2.56	24132	890
WHITEHOUSE FARM	Macon	H	4/4/2019	243	90	73.7	3.7	2.54	22556	848
RUFUS YODER JR	Macon	H	3/15/2019	157	92	74.2	3.5	2.46	21635	810
COASTAL PLAIN EXP STATION*	Tift	H	4/18/2019	251	90	66	4	2.45	24038	893
WALNUT BRANCH FARM	Washington	H	3/27/2019	500	86	72.5	3.7	2.45	18662	717

[1]***Minimum herd or permanent string size of 20 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).***

UGA extension

Top GA DHIA By Test Day Milk Production – May 2019										
					Test Day Average				Yearly Average	
Herd	County	Br.	Test Date	[1]Cows	% in Milk	Milk	% Fat	TD Fat	Milk	Lbs. Fat
DAVE CLARK*	Morgan	H	5/6/2019	1176	89	96.8	4	3.45	30654	1259
RODGERS' HILLCREST FARMS INC.*	McDuffie	H	5/16/2019	425	88	94.8	4	3.45	30653	1229
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	H	5/9/2019	286	91	90.6	3.7	3	28664	1111
A & J DAIRY*	Wilkes	H	5/28/2019	433	91	89.4			28386	
TROY YODER	Macon	H	4/30/2019	296	89	86.4	3.6	2.76	25919	1024
J.EVERETT WILLIAMS*	Morgan	X	5/13/2019	1983	88	86	4	3.07	27147	1177
VISSCHER DAIRY LLC*	Jefferson	H	5/17/2019	985	88	84.8	3.3	2.52	22545	803
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	H	5/28/2019	434	89	83.8	3.2	2.38	26056	895
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	H	5/4/2019	726	90	82.1	3.5	2.57	27001	953
PHIL HARVEY #2	Putnam	H	5/16/2019	1556	88	81	3.8	2.68	25084	955
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	H	5/21/2019	999	90	79.3	3.8	2.68	25287	943
R & D DAIRY	Lamar	H	4/24/2019	302	93	77	3.7	2.73	24688	981
IRVIN R YODER	Macon	H	5/24/2019	210	89	76.9	3.6	2.54	24664	922
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	H	5/7/2019	312	89	74.8	3.5	2.51	23324	937
SOUTHERN SANDS FARM	Burke	H	5/14/2019	87	90	72.5	3.3	2.08	23857	879
RUFUS YODER JR	Macon	H	5/2/2019	153	91	70.8	3.5	2.28	21628	802
TWIN OAKS FARM	Jefferson	H	5/16/2019	85	89	70.6	3.4	2.35	22087	846
WHITEHOUSE FARM	Macon	H	5/7/2019	243	90	69.4	3.7	2.25	22455	845
BOBBY JOHNSON	Grady	X	4/30/2019	546	91	68.1			20487	
BRENNEMAN FARMS	Macon	H	5/16/2019	50	82	67.4	3.6	2.45	19615	693

[1]***Minimum herd or permanent string size of 20 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).***

UGA extension

Top GA DHIA By Test Day Fat Production – May 2019										
					Test Day Average				Yearly Average	
Herd	County	Br.	Test Date	[1]Cows	% in Milk	Milk	% Fat	TD Fat	Milk	Lbs. Fat
DAVE CLARK*	Morgan	H	5/6/2019	1176	89	96.8	4	3.45	30654	1259
RODGERS' HILLCREST FARMS INC.*	McDuffie	H	5/16/2019	425	88	94.8	4	3.45	30653	1229
J.EVERETT WILLIAMS*	Morgan	X	5/13/2019	1983	88	86	4	3.07	27147	1177
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	H	5/9/2019	286	91	90.6	3.7	3	28664	1111
TROY YODER	Macon	H	4/30/2019	296	89	86.4	3.6	2.76	25919	1024
R & D DAIRY	Lamar	H	4/24/2019	302	93	77	3.7	2.73	24688	981
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	H	5/21/2019	999	90	79.3	3.8	2.68	25287	943
PHIL HARVEY #2	Putnam	H	5/16/2019	1556	88	81	3.8	2.68	25084	955
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	H	5/4/2019	726	90	82.1	3.5	2.57	27001	953
IRVIN R YODER	Macon	H	5/24/2019	210	89	76.9	3.6	2.54	24664	922
JOHN WESTSTEYN*	Bacon	X	5/1/2019	1352	91	65.6	4.1	2.53	19702	805
VISSCHER DAIRY LLC*	Jefferson	H	5/17/2019	985	88	84.8	3.3	2.52	22545	803
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	H	5/7/2019	312	89	74.8	3.5	2.51	23324	937
COASTAL PLAIN EXP STATION	Tift	H	5/18/2019	248	90	66.4	4.1	2.48	23554	884
SOUTHERN ROSE FARMS	Laurens	H	4/26/2019	95	88	67	4	2.48	20669	816
BRENNEMAN FARMS	Macon	H	5/16/2019	50	82	67.4	3.6	2.45	19615	693
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	H	5/28/2019	434	89	83.8	3.2	2.38	26056	895
BOB MOORE	Putnam	H	5/7/2019	190	89	63.7	3.8	2.37	19691	788
HALE DAIRY	Oconee	H	4/15/2019	96	89	54.7	4.3	2.35	14983	625
TWIN OAKS FARM	Jefferson	H	5/16/2019	85	89	70.6	3.4	2.35	22087	846

[1]***Minimum herd or permanent string size of 20 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).***

UGA extension

Top GA Lows Herds for SCC –TD Average Score – March 2019									
Herd	**County**	**Test Date**	**Br.**	**[1]Cows**	**Milk-Rolling**	**SCC-TD-Average Score**	**SCC-TD-Weight Average**	**SCC-Average Score**	**SCC-Wt.**
DAVID ADDIS	Whitfield	3/19/2019	H	34	17882	1.4	38	1.7	129
BRENNEMAN FARMS	Macon	3/14/2019	H	50	19386	1.5	73	2	163
J.EVERETT WILLIAMS*	Morgan	3/11/2019	X	2014	27324	1.9	138	2.1	185
ALEX MILLICAN	Walker	2/26/2019	H	100	17502	2	154	2.4	197
IRVIN R YODER	Macon	2/26/2019	H	230	24089	2	159	2.2	141
RUFUS YODER JR	Macon	3/15/2019	H	157	21635	2	160	2.6	197
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	3/18/2019	J	30	17228	2.1	81	1.7	84
DAVE CLARK*	Morgan	3/4/2019	H	1164	30827	2.1	166	2.2	204
SOUTHERN SANDS FARM	Burke	3/25/2019	H	93	24132	2.1	167	2.4	142
W.T.MERIWETHER	Morgan	3/12/2019	H	72	17685	2.2	130	3.1	288
EUGENE KING	Macon	3/19/2019	H	116	18788	2.2	157	2.3	169
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	2/27/2019	H	325	23442	2.3	165	2.3	170
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	3/18/2019	H	1028	25523	2.3	196	2.3	203
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	3/26/2019	H	422	25811	2.4	163	2.8	266
VISSCHER DAIRY LLC*	Jefferson	2/25/2019	H	1025	22824	2.4	168	2.8	242
LOUIS YODER	Macon	2/20/2019	H	114	20000	2.4	244	2.7	319
JAMES W MOON	Morgan	3/12/2019	H	116	17573	2.5	201	2.5	184
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	3/7/2019	H	285	28568	2.5	215	2.2	198
JERRY SWAFFORD	Putnam	2/27/2019	X	107	16661	2.6	133	3	231
RODGERS' HILLCREST FARMS INC.*	McDuffie	3/6/2019	H	443	31396	2.6	213	2.7	225

[1]Minimum herd or permanent string size of 20 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).

UGA extension

Top GA Lows Herds for SCC –TD Average Score – April 2019									
Herd	**County**	**Test Date**	**Br.**	**[1]Cows**	**Milk-Rolling**	**SCC-TD-Average Score**	**SCC-TD-Weight Average**	**SCC-Average Score**	**SCC-Wt.**
BRENNEMAN FARMS	Macon	4/22/2019	H	50	19566	1.4	67	2	136
DAVID ADDIS	Whitfield	4/16/2019	H	33	17810	1.7	48	1.7	112
J.EVERETT WILLIAMS*	Morgan	4/15/2019	X	2027	27216	1.8	146	2.1	184
IRVIN R YODER	Macon	4/6/2019	H	223	24385	2	116	2.1	140
DAVE CLARK*	Morgan	4/8/2019	H	1189	30706	2	147	2.2	199
RUFUS YODER JR	Macon	3/15/2019	H	157	21635	2	160	2.6	197
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	3/29/2019	H	322	23398	2.1	148	2.3	168
VISSCHER DAIRY LLC*	Jefferson	4/3/2019	H	1028	22621	2.1	166	2.8	237
SOUTHERN SANDS FARM	Burke	3/25/2019	H	93	24132	2.1	167	2.4	142
EUGENE KING	Macon	3/19/2019	H	116	18788	2.2	157	2.3	169
WALNUT BRANCH FARM	Washington	3/27/2019	H	500	18662	2.2	191	3.1	285
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	3/26/2019	H	422	25811	2.4	163	2.8	266
WHITEHOUSE FARM	Macon	4/4/2019	H	243	22556	2.4	206	2.9	240
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	4/18/2019	J	32	17175	2.5	82	1.8	88
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	4/10/2019	H	291	28598	2.5	206	2.2	201
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	4/1/2019	H	728	26907	2.6	216	2.7	228
JAMES W MOON	Morgan	4/16/2019	H	114	17476	2.7	215	2.5	189
ROGERS FARM SERVICES	Tattnall	4/1/2019	H	162	17422	2.8	159	3.1	297
PHIL HARVEY #2	Putnam	3/21/2019	H	1505	24945	2.8	227	2.7	248
LOUIS YODER	Macon	4/24/2019	H	112	19696	2.8	344	2.7	331

[1]Minimum herd or permanent string size of 20 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).

UGA extension

Top GA Lows Herds for SCC –TD Average Score – May 2019									
Herd	**County**	**Test Date**	**Br.**	**[1]Cows**	**Milk-Rolling**	**SCC-TD-Average Score**	**SCC-TD-Weight Average**	**SCC-Average Score**	**SCC-Wt.**
WALNUT BRANCH FARM	Washington	5/15/2019	H	499	19000	1.1	107	2.8	266
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	5/21/2019	H	999	25287	1.2	115	2.2	201
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	5/16/2019	J	32	17095	1.2	134	1.8	96
BRENNEMAN FARMS	Macon	5/16/2019	H	50	19615	1.3	76	1.9	136
IRVIN R YODER	Macon	5/24/2019	H	210	24664	1.6	92	2.1	141
DAVID ADDIS	Whitfield	5/20/2019	H	33	17596	1.6	115	1.8	119
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	5/7/2019	H	312	23324	1.7	111	2.3	162
DAVE CLARK*	Morgan	5/6/2019	H	1176	30654	1.8	155	2.2	193
RUFUS YODER JR	Macon	5/2/2019	H	153	21628	2	129	2.5	187
RODGERS' HILLCREST FARMS INC.*	McDuffie	5/16/2019	H	425	30653	2	188	2.7	225
VISSCHER DAIRY LLC*	Jefferson	5/17/2019	H	985	22545	2	209	2.7	234
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	5/28/2019	H	434	26056	2.1	157	2.7	245
PHIL HARVEY #2	Putnam	5/16/2019	H	1556	25084	2.1	178	2.8	254
WHITEHOUSE FARM	Macon	5/7/2019	H	243	22455	2.2	171	2.9	240
ALEX MILLICAN	Walker	5/21/2019	H	100	17531	2.2	193	2.5	214
J.EVERETT WILLIAMS*	Morgan	5/13/2019	X	1983	27147	2.2	199	2.1	183
TWIN OAKS FARM	Jefferson	5/16/2019	H	85	22087	2.2	249	3.1	319
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	5/9/2019	H	286	28664	2.3	198	2.3	208
COASTAL PLAIN EXP STATION*	Tift	5/18/2019	H	248	23554	2.4	151	2.7	235
DONALD NEWBERRY	Bibb	4/27/2019	H	144	15060	2.4	206	3	236

[1]Minimum herd or permanent string size of 20 cows. Yearly average calculated after 365 days on test. Test day milk, marked with an asterisk (*), indicates herd was milked three times per day (3X). Information in this table is compiled from Dairy Records Management Systems Reports (Raleigh, NC).

UGA extension