



## Dear Dairy Producers:

IN

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.

NSIDE THIS ISSUE: April May June, 2022	
Beat the heat!	
By: Dr. Sha Tao	Page 2
What to expect when expecting Holstein-Angus crossbred calves	
By: Drs. Brad Heins, Emmanuel Rollin, and T. Dean Pringle	Page 3 - 5
Understanding bacterial counts in milk	
By: Drs. Valerie Ryman and Emmanuel Rollin	Page 6 - 9
Trotter named Executive Director of Georgia Milk Producers, Inc.	
Adapted from: Georgia Milk Producers E-News	Page 10 - 11
Important dates	Page 12
Top 20 DHIA high herds by test day milk and fat production & low herds for SCC score	Page 13 - 21
Sincerely,	
She Top Associate Professor	
Associate Professor	



### Beat the heat!

Sha Tao, Ph.D., Associate Professor, stao@uga.edu/706-542-0658

Department of Animal and Dairy Science, UGA

We are experiencing significant heat stress now in GA, and the weather will be even hotter next week. At this point, all the cooling system should be up running. However, it is always helpful to walk through the farm and identify some areas that can be improved and fixed quickly to better prepare for the next wave of heat:

- 1. Cows in the free stall barns tend to stand longer under feed line soakers under heat stress. Good fan ventilation and good water sprinkling are essential. Make sure all sprinklers work well, and the on-off cycle can be changed as weather gets hotter. The key is to ensure cows are wet all the time when they stand below the sprinklers. Good speed of fans determines the success of evaporative cooling, but the direction of the fans is important too. There are many cases where fans are placed in the wrong direction and the ventilation cannot cover the cows. Make sure the wind blows towards the cow when she stands below the sprinklers. If you see cows gather around the water trough too long, that likely means the evaporative cooling system is not that effective to cool cows.
- Grazing producers can consider running pivot cooling until midnight during the hottest days. Data suggest that cow body temperature elevates significantly after turning off pivot in the evening.
- 3. For heifers or dry cows without access to fan ventilation and evaporative cooling, make sure all animals have access to shade provided by trees or artificial shade. If you are feeding these animals TMR or PMR in the feed bunk, they likely go to the feed bunk in the early morning when their body temperature reaches the lowest point in a day, so make sure there are feed in the bunk.
- 4. Make sure the water troughs are clean and always have fresh water, and avoid sunlight.
- 5. For calves housed in the hutches, providing additional shade-cloth or natural shade over the hutches will help, and it would be better to not only cover the hutches but also provide shade outside the hutches. Hutch internal temperature is higher than outside in the afternoon, and calves may go outside if there was a shade for better ventilation and cooler air. Make sure water buckets are clean and always have fresh water. Avoid water buckets under sunlight.

These areas are sometimes overlooked and can be improved and fixed quickly in order to prepare for the upcoming extreme weather. Other essential areas such as holding pen, exit lane cooling, dry cow management, etc. that may not be improved in a short time frame, are not discussed here, but critical for maximal cow cooling. Do not wait to improve your cooling system, because GA summer is always long and hot.



### What to expect when expecting Holstein-Angus crossbred calves

**Brad Heins<sup>1</sup>**, DVM, MFAM, Clinical Assistant Professor, Beef Production Medicine, 706-542-4312/bheins@uga.edu

**Emmanuel Rollin<sup>1</sup>,** DVM, MFAM, Clinical Associate Professor, Dairy Production Medicine, 706-202-7821/Emmanuel@uga.edu

Department of Population Health | The University of Georgia College of Veterinary Medicine **T. Dean Pringle**<sup>2</sup>, Ph.D. Professor, <u>dpringle@uga.edu</u>

<sup>1</sup>Food Animal Health and Management Program, College of Veterinary Medicine, and <sup>2</sup>Department of Animal and Dairy Science, University of Georgia, Athens GA

A team of researchers from the University of Georgia College of Veterinary Medicine and the Department of Animal and Dairy Science have been investigating performance of Holstein-Angus crossbred calves. Production of crossbred calves is receiving increased consideration across the country as dairy producers are looking for opportunities to increase the value of male calves. Semen companies have identified the shift towards increased use of beef breed semen in dairy breedings with a shift in beef semen sales from 2.54 million doses in 2017 to 7.2 million doses in 2020 and a decrease in dairy semen sales from 23.2 million doses to 18.3 million doses in the same time period<sup>1</sup>. The American Angus Association has led the development of genetic index values such as Angus-on-Holstein (\$AxH) and Angus-on-Jersey (\$AxJ) to allow for easier identification of bulls to select for inclusion in future matings. These indices target animal growth, carcass muscling, and calving ease and the \$AxH index aims to also reduce carcass size by providing negative pressure on Yearling Height (YH).

Our research has been focused on the impact of early life nutrition on lifetime performance in these calves. Data collection continues as our animals have entered the feeding phase, but early results may help alleviate the concerns expressed by some producers regarding potential complications including calving and milk feeding these crossbred calves in the commercial dairy environment. The Angus bulls used in this study were selected prior to publication of the \$AxH index but both bulls have remained in the top 10% of bulls for that trait. The primary selection criteria were Calving Ease Direct (CED), Ribeye Area (RE), Marbling (Marb), and a slight negative pressure on Yearling Height. Additional research published in 2020 indicates that conception rates of beef bulls when used on dairy females is lower than traditional breeding, however this decrease in conception rate may be artificial due to the planned utilization of beef semen in animals with potentially lower fertility including problem breeders, older animals, and those with lower genetic merit<sup>2</sup>. All breedings for this research were performed on 2nd lactation or older cows.

Calving began on January 19, 2021 and was finalized on February 27, 2021 for the breedings selected for this project. Treatment enrollment was by birth order and calves were placed into the groups in an alternating manner. All calves at birth received four quarts of colostrum, an intranasal vaccine and were allocated to treatment groups. Treatment Group A received three quarts of milk product three times daily while Treatment Group B received two quarts of milk product twice daily. Both treatment groups had free choice access to calf starter and water between milk feedings. In total, 160 calves were identified for inclusion in the research program. Eighty calves were placed into Treatment Group A and eighty calves placed into Treatment Group B. Due to other breedings occurring on the farm, four calves with incorrect sires were also enrolled into the study. This was



determined through genomic testing and sire verification. For final analysis, these calves will be excluded from the final study results but their data is included here.

Birthweight was similar between groups, however we did recognize a nearly 8 lb difference in birth weight between heifer and bull calves, which may represent increased dystocia risk depending on mature cow size. On this farm, all calvings are monitored by experienced personnel and Calving Ease was a scaled system with the following parameters and results of the calves born for this program:

Table 1: Calving Ease and Birth Weights		
Calving Ease	# Calves	Average Weight
CE1: No assistance Needed	140	94.3
CE2: Minor Assistance Needed	14	87.21
CE3: Difficult Delivery or C-Section Required	6	93.7

All bull calves were banded within 7 days of age if both testicles were descended. In this dataset, being a bull calves had a slightly higher calving ease score, which may be associated with increased need of assistance during delivery as shown in Table 2.

While not accounting for treatment group, average daily gain at weaning did not differ between heifer and steer calves although there was a numerical difference in post-weaning performance by sex. This may be due to the increased birth weight of male calves and subsequent increased nutritional requirements which were not provided due to standardization of feeding rates. Many of these calves experienced scours in the pre-weaning period but mortality remained 1.875% pre-weaning and an additional 1.875% post-weaning losing six calves prior to transition to the feedyard.

Table 2: Avera	age Early Life	Performance	e Data by S	ex			
	Gestation	Calving	Birth	Weaning	ADG to	Weight 45 Days	ADG 45 Days
Calf Sex	Length	Ease	Weight	Weight	Weaning	Post Weaning	Post Weaning
Female (81)	277	1.14	90.0	180.9	1.57	254.9	1.89
Male (79)	278	1.19	97.4	187.3	1.57	264.1	1.97
	278	1.16	93.7	184.0	1.57	259.4	1.93

A step-down approach was utilized to reduce milk product by half in the 7 days prior to weaning in an effort to increase starter intake. As shown in Table 3, calves in Group A gained 0.3 pounds per day more than calves in Group B in the pre-weaning period. However, that average daily gain difference was not maintained during 7-day post-weaning growth phase, potentially due to increased starter intake in Group B as those calves were not consuming as much milk and had less difficulty transitioning away from milk replacer during weaning or a result of compensatory gain. By 45 days post-weaning, both treatment groups were gaining at a similar trajectory.



Table 3: Post-W	eaning Performa	ance by Treatment G	roups			
Treatment	Average Birth	Average Weaning	Weaning	ADG 7 Days Post-	Average Weight 45	ADG 45 Days
Group	Weight	Weight	ADG	Weaning	Days Post-Weaning	Post-Weaning
А	92.7	191.32	1.71	1.72	267.4	1.93
В	94.6	176.60	1.42	1.83	251.3	1.92
	93.7	184.01	1.57	1.77	259.4	1.93

These calves have performed similarly to the Holstein heifers present on the dairy during this same feeding period. Post-weaning, the calves continued to grow, reaching an average of 625 lbs by November 2021. The calves are now at a feedlot in South Georgia and have an anticipated slaughter date of October-November 2022. Growth performance, carcass ultrasound data will continue to be collected through finishing period with actual carcass data being collected as the cattle are slaughtered with the goal to determine the potential impact of early life nutrition.

This project receives funding from the Georgia Commodity Commission for Beef and would not be possible without the checkoff funding of beef and dairy producers throughout Georgia. We thank you for your continued support and look forward to updating this information in the coming year.

### REFERENCE

- 1. Geiger C. Beef on dairy more than doubled in two years. Hoard's Dairyman Intel, 2020.
- 2. McWhorter TM, Hutchison JL, Norman HD, et al. Investigating conception rate for beef service sires bred to dairy cows and heifers. J Dairy Sci 2020;103:10374-10382.

.



### **Understanding bacterial counts in milk**

Valerie E. Ryman, PhD, PAS

Assistant Professor and Extension Dairy Specialist 706-542-9105/<u>vryman@uga.edu</u>
Department of Animal and Dairy Science, UGA

Emmanuel Rollin, DVM MFAM

Clinical Associate Professor

Department of Population Health, College of Veterinary Medicine, UGA

While there are multiple different interpretations and definitions of milk quality depending on the audience, two of the most important indicators of herd milk quality for producers include bulk tank somatic cell count (SCC) and bacterial count. According to the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance, SCC should be below 750,000 cells/milliliter (mL) and total bacterial count should be below 100,000 colony forming units (CFU)/mL (before pasteurization), though different limits may be set by other entities such as the milk co-operative and/or the processor. Premiums may be attained and penalties may also be levied based on SCC and bacterial counts, which may have a large impact on farm profitability.

Bulk tank and individual SCC may be impacted by mammary infection (mastitis), days in milk, age, stage of lactation, and season, with infection being the primary contributor to elevated SCC. In most cases if SCC are elevated, the focus should be on reducing mastitis, both clinical AND subclinical. Steps to take include, but are not limited to, 1) conducting bulk tank cultures and then most likely individual cultures, 2) developing a treatment and possibly culling plan for identified animals, 3) re-evaluating proper milking procedures with personnel, and 4) double-checking milking machine function.

Investigation into elevated bulk tank bacterial counts is also complex, though the source (i.e., typically infected glands), may not be as easy to pinpoint. Bacteria found in the bulk tank may come from various places and include: the udder, the milking environment, and the milking equipment (including the bulk tank). There are 4 basic bacterial counts that are of importance and they are, total bacteria count commonly reported as standard plate count (SPC) or plate loop count (PLC), preliminary incubation count (PIC or PI count), laboratory pasteurization count (LPC), and coliform count (CC). This brief article will explain what each of those tests represents, suggest limits which represent exceptional milk quality, and share areas to investigate when concerns arise. At the conclusion of this article, a summary table is included to provide a resource which can be printed and/or included in standard operating procedures.

### Standard plate count (SPC) or plate loop count (PLC)

The SPC or PLC (SPC/PLC) represents the total bacterial population in milk. The milk is cultured on an agar plate or a petrifilm, incubated at approximately 90°F for 48 hours, at which time all of the colonies are counted. Many reports which give a value that should be multiplied by 1000 to get the total bacterial count. For example, if your bulk tank report says 25, the actual total bacteria count is 25,000 CFU/mL. Although the PMO has a limit of 100,000 CFU/mL, other entities have lower thresholds above which either results in lost premiums, penalties applied, and/or loss of market. *The goal for SPC/PLC should be below 5,000 CFU/mL, but up to 10,000 CFU/mL can be acceptable.* The SPC/PLC is the greatest reflection of farm and cow hygiene.



Dirty facilities/equipment and dirty cows will almost always be reflected in the SPC.

Having a bulk tank analysis conducted is especially beneficial in the event that SPC/PLC is increased, since it identifies which bacterial groups are present in high levels, instead of only the total number. Most bulk tank analyses will give bacterial levels of contagious bacteria and environmental bacteria separately. Contagious bacteria, which can only come from within udders, include *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Streptococcus agalactiae* (frequently called "Strep ag"). Environmental bacteria, which can come from the udder, the milking environment, or the milking system, include coliforms (sometimes referred to as coliform count), Gram negative rods, other *Streptococcus*, *Staphylococcus* species, and Gram-positive rods (Bacillus). The coliform count may be elevated as a result of mastitis (*Escherichia coli* or *Klebsiella* as an example), but is often increased due to fecal contamination (discussed below). Fecal contamination would be introduced due to poor cleaning of both the milking equipment as well as the cow's teats and udder during milking.

### **Preliminary incubation count (PIC or PI count)**

The PIC indicates the presence of cold tolerant bacteria (psychrophilic bacteria). Milk is first incubated at 55°F for 18 hours at which time SPC/PLC procedures are followed. Although there are no legal standards set by the PMO, many co-ops/processors have established thresholds. Since SPC/PLC procedures are following after the initial incubation, it is not uncommon for PIC to be similar to SPC/PLC. In many cases, the PIC is slightly higher than SPC/PLC even in clean, healthy herds with excellent parlor cleaning protocols. *Most operations should be able to achieve a PIC of less than 20,000 CFU/mL, though it is best to evaluate PIC in comparison to or alongside SPC/PLC*. Additional scenarios to consider:

- If both the SPC/PLC and PIC are similarly elevated, mastitis or dirty cows/equipment may be probable culprits.
- A PIC greater than three times the SPC/PLC is typically indicative of dirty equipment and/or poor cooling.
- o Common areas of concern when PIC above SPC/PLC are elevated include water temperature not high enough during <u>all steps of wash cycle</u>, incorrect formulation or absence of sanitizing chemicals in wash, cooling too slow or not cooling enough, and milking wet teats.
  - If SPC is substantially higher than PIC, infected udders (mastitis) are a likely culprit.

### **Laboratory pasteurization count (LPC)**

The LPC indicates bacteria which survive high temperatures (thermoduric bacteria). Milk is heated to 145°F for 30 minutes (similar to standard vat pasteurization) and once cooled is plated according to SPC/PLC procedures. Any bacteria that survive are problematic from a food safety perspective, thus it makes sense that LPC should be quite low. Though there are no legal standards set by the PMO for unpasteurized milk, co-ops/processors may impose their own criteria. A LPC below 50 CFU/mL in quality milk is achievable in most markets, though 200-300 CFU/mL may be acceptable. Elevations in LPC are typically a result of consistent failures in cleaning, particularly the milking equipment, but with significantly elevated LPC, teat and udder hygiene cannot be completely ruled out as a contributing factor. If LPC is elevated as a result of teat and



udder cleanliness, there are usually elevations in either SPC/PLC or coliforms. Conversely if PIC and LPC are similarly elevated, this is a clear sign that dirty equipment, cleaning, and cooling are possible culprits. Common contributors to elevated LPC (and PIC) include *Bacillus* and *Pseudomonas*. These bacteria are capable of surviving on old rubber parts and within water, and are notoriously difficult to address.

### **Coliform Count (CC)**

The coliform count gives a numerical count of coliform bacteria, such as *E. coli* and *Klebsiella*, in milk. Coliform bacteria are largely considered gut/fecal bacteria and thus their presence indicates contamination from the environment, especially manure contamination. Contamination can be on the cow, the milking equipment, and potentially in the parlor or wash water, with increases exacerbated by poor milking practices. *Ideally the CC is below detection (value of 0 or no value would be reported)*, however given that these bacteria are abundant, up to 50 CFU/mL may be acceptable in high quality milk.

### **Troubleshooting high bacteria counts**

Troubleshooting high bacteria counts should include a thorough investigation into the following:

- ⇒ Milking routine evaluation, especially teat sanitation methods
- ⇒ Udder hygiene scoring and cow bedding evaluation
- $\Rightarrow$  A complete milking system washup analysis including times, temperatures, chemical concentrations, and wash slug analysis
  - ⇒ A cooling analysis to determine speed of milk cooling
  - ⇒ Clinical and subclinical mastitis evaluation (milk cultures and SCC)

### **Summary**

- The SPC/ PLC represents the total bacteria count and should be less than 5,000 CFU/mL.
- The PIC or PI count indicates the presence of cold tolerant bacteria and should be less than 20,000 CFU/mL, though it is best to evaluate PIC alongside SPC (less than 3 times SPC)
- The LPC indicates bacteria which survive high temperatures and should be less than 50 CFU/mL, though up to 200-300 CFU/mL is a generally accepted threshold.
- The CC indicates the number of coliform bacteria and should be near 0 or absent, but can be up to 50 CFU/mL.



	Descriptive Inform	mation	Bacte	erial Level (CFU/	/mL)	So	Source of High Bacterial Counts			
Test	Name	What is measured	High	Acceptable	Excellent	Mastitis	Dirty Cows	Dirty Equipment	Poor Cooling	
SPC/PLC <sup>1,2</sup>	Standard plate count/plate loop count	Total number of aerobic bacteria	>10,000	5-10,000	<5,000	Possible	Possible	Possible	Possible	
PIC <sup>3</sup>	Preliminary incubation count	Bacteria that grow at cold temperatures	>20,000	10-20,000	10,000	Possible	Possible	Possible	Possible	
LPC <sup>4</sup>	Laboratory pasteurization count	Bacteria that survive pasteurization	>200	50-200	<50	Unlikely	Possible	Very likely	Unlikely	
CC <sup>5</sup>	Coliform count	Gram-negative bacteria, such as <i>E. coli</i>	<100	50-100	<50	Possible	Possible	Possible	Not likely, though possible	
		PIC higher than	n SPC <sup>6</sup>			Unlikely	Possible	Very likely	Very likely	
Not likely, Not likely, SPC higher than PIC Possible though though possible possible									Not likely, though possible	

<sup>1.</sup>SPC greater than 10,000 but less than  $100,000 \Rightarrow$  some Streptococcus species are noted to shed at high levels, can be confirmed with bulk tank analysis that reports strep levels



<sup>2.</sup> Few mammary infections cause shedding that would increase SPC beyond 100,000, therefore when SPC are beyond 100,000 the more likely culprits are dirty equipment and/or poor cooling

<sup>3.</sup>Dirty cows may contribute especially if SPC is also elevated; Insufficient cleaning (water temperature, sanitizing concentration, etc.)

<sup>4.</sup> Persistent insufficient cleaning (water temperature, sanitizing concentration, etc.); If coliform count is also elevated, dirty cows may be large contributor

 $<sup>5.</sup> Rare \ for \ coliform \ mastitis \ to \ increase \ coliform \ count \ \underline{consistently}, \ more \ likely \ unhygienic \ conditions$ 

<sup>6.</sup> Anecdotally, some environmental streps have been associated with elevated PIC

# Trotter named Executive Director of Georgia Milk Producers, Inc. By Georgia Milk Producers E-News



Bryce Trotter, Gainesville, GA, has been named Executive Director of Georgia Milk Producers, Inc. Georgia Milk is a farmer-funded advocacy, education, and communication organization.

Trotter served as a Senior Policy Advisor in the office of Georgia Agriculture Commissioner Gary Black, and was the Campaign Manager for Black's successful 2018 reelection as Commissioner. He then became Campaign Manager for Black's U.S. Senate bid.

Trotter is no stranger to the work required on a dairy. As a college student he worked as Crop Yield Project Manager for summer silage harvest, cleaned out stalls, and assisted with a variety of daily chores alongside his father. This on-farm experience is what inspired him to stay in agriculture and work for dairy farm families in his home state.

Because he spent time doing chores at Westbrook Dairy, LLC, he learned firsthand that every detail matters when it comes to producing quality milk for consumers.

Bryce says "I am extremely excited to be joining Georgia Milk Producers, and would like to thank the Board of Directors for trusting me with this opportunity! GMP is a valuable resource not only for Georgia's dairy community, but the Southeast as well. I know we will be able to continue to grow our industry together."

"I also wish to thank Farrah Newberry for her role in building GMP into the effective organization it is today, and I look forward to continuing to build on that firm foundation."

He continues "I'm a lifelong milk drinker, and enjoy many other dairy products too! Georgia is now the top producer of milk in the Southeast, and I'm proud to join the outstanding dairy farmers of Georgia as we promote the message that milk is a natural nutrient powerhouse!"

Matt Johnson, President of Georgia Milk Producers, says "With his combination of on-farm dairy experience at one of the southeast's most progressive dairies, along with his government and political experience, Bryce's unique skillset is a natural fit for the current and future needs of Georgia's dairy farming industry."



Johnson continues: "Because he already has an established working relationship with a number of agriculture organizations, he can hit the ground running."

Trotter graduated from Davidson College in 2017, with a B.A. in Political Science. While at Davidson, he was a leader in a number of student organizations.

He and his wife, Emma, have been married since January of 2022, and currently reside in Gainesville, GA



# 1mportant Dates 2022

# The American Dairy Science Association (ADSA) Annual Meeting

- June 19-22, 2022
- UGA undergraduate and graduate students will participate and present their research
- https://www.adsa.org/Meetings/2022-Annual-Meeting



	Top GA	DHIA	By Test Day M	lilk Produc	tion – March 202	22				
					<u>Te</u>	st Day A	verage		Yearly	Average
<u>Herd</u>	County	<u>Br.</u>	Test Date	<sup>1</sup> Cows	% in Milk	Milk	% Fat	TD Fat	<u>Milk</u>	Lbs. Fat
GODFREY DAIRY FARM*	Morgan	НО	3/7/2022	1204	89	103.2	4.1	3.89	31558	1238
WDAIRY LLC*	Morgan	XX	3/21/2022	1997	86	92.7	4.4	3.63	28897	1275
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	НО	3/20/2022	718	90	91.3	3.6	3.07	29233	1083
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	НО	3/1/2022	327	89	91	4	3.34	29257	1210
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	НО	3/7/2022	189	88	90.8	3.8	3.1	28368	1066
A & J DAIRY*	Wilkes	НО	3/10/2022	362	92	90.4	0	0	27981	0
VISSCHER DAIRY LLC*	Jefferson	НО	3/3/2022	819	87	89.7	0	0	24009	496
JERRY SWAFFORD	Putnam	НО	3/23/2022	139	84	87	3.5	2.74	20725	772
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	НО	3/8/2022	1063	89	82.3	3.8	2.87	24703	906
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	НО	3/24/2022	438	87	81.9	3.5	2.66	26598	935
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	НО	3/18/2022	364	89	80.8	4.3	3.11	21555	865
OCMULGEE DAIRY	Houston	НО	2/24/2022	359	87	78.4	3.5	2.45	23885	842
RYAN HOLDEMAN	Jefferson	НО	3/16/2022	96	88	77.1	3.8	2.41	20695	805
RODNEY & CARLIN GIESBRECHT	Washington	НО	3/21/2022	397	90	73.3	3.9	2.66	22727	806
BOB MOORE	Putnam	НО	3/22/2022	502	88	72.4	4.3	3.02	20354	853
HORST CREST FARMS	Burke	НО	2/24/2022	153	82	67.9	3.7	2.26	18734	716
JAMES W MOON	Morgan	НО	3/9/2022	132	86	67.7	3.8	2.46	19599	747
W.T.MERIWETHER	Morgan	НО	3/23/2022	76	86	66.7	3.3	1.91	19247	676
FRANKS FARM	Burke	BS	3/15/2022	181	89	59.2	3.9	2.09	18888	788
UNIV OF GA DAIRY FARM	Clarke	XX	2/24/2022	140	85	59.1	4.2	2	20754	832

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>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 Produ	ıction – March	2022				
						Test Day Av	erage_		Yearly	Average
<u>Herd</u>	County	Br.	Test Date	1Cows	% in Milk	<u>Milk</u>	% Fat	TD Fat	<u>Milk</u>	Lbs. Fat
GODFREY DAIRY FARM*	Morgan	НО	3/7/2022	1204	89	103.2	4.1	3.89	31558	1238
WDAIRY LLC*	Morgan	XX	3/21/2022	1997	86	92.7	4.4	3.63	28897	1275
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	НО	3/1/2022	327	89	91	4	3.34	29257	1210
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	НО	3/18/2022	364	89	80.8	4.3	3.11	21555	865
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	НО	3/7/2022	189	88	90.8	3.8	3.1	28368	1066
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	НО	3/20/2022	718	90	91.3	3.6	3.07	29233	1083
BOB MOORE	Putnam	НО	3/22/2022	502	88	72.4	4.3	3.02	20354	853
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	НО	3/8/2022	1063	89	82.3	3.8	2.87	24703	906
JERRY SWAFFORD	Putnam	НО	3/23/2022	139	84	87	3.5	2.74	20725	772
RODNEY & CARLIN GIESBRECHT	Washington	НО	3/21/2022	397	90	73.3	3.9	2.66	22727	806
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	НО	3/24/2022	438	87	81.9	3.5	2.66	26598	935
JAMES W MOON	Morgan	НО	3/9/2022	132	86	67.7	3.8	2.46	19599	747
OCMULGEE DAIRY	Houston	НО	2/24/2022	359	87	78.4	3.5	2.45	23885	842
RYAN HOLDEMAN	Jefferson	НО	3/16/2022	96	88	77.1	3.8	2.41	20695	805
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	JE	3/8/2022	34	83	56.6	4.7	2.35	16189	763
HORST CREST FARMS	Burke	НО	2/24/2022	153	82	67.9	3.7	2.26	18734	716
FRANKS FARM	Burke	BS	3/15/2022	181	89	59.2	3.9	2.09	18888	788
ROGERS FARM SERVICES	Tattnall	XX	3/8/2022	147	87	52.1	4.4	2.01	15455	676
UNIV OF GA DAIRY FARM	Clarke	XX	2/24/2022	140	85	59.1	4.2	2	20754	832
WEIR DAIRY	Seminole	НО	3/17/2022	83	90	52.1	3.8	1.93	15496	599

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>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 I	Milk Produ	ction – April 2022					
					Te	st Day A	verage		Yearly	Average
<u>Herd</u>	County	<u>Br.</u>	Test date	1Cows	% in Milk	Milk	% Fat	TD Fat	<u>Milk</u>	Lbs. Fat
GODFREY DAIRY FARM*	Morgan	НО	4/4/2022	1193	89	103.9	4	3.84	31840	1249
WDAIRY LLC*	Morgan	XX	4/18/2022	1963	87	93.2	4.3	3.62	28980	1274
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	НО	4/21/2022	718	90	92.2	3.6	3.12	29217	1084
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	НО	4/5/2022	310	89	91.9	3.8	3.23	29333	1203
A & J DAIRY*	Wilkes	НО	4/14/2022	380	92	90.2	0	0	28059	0
TROY YODER	Macon	НО	3/31/2022	314	86	88.7	3.5	2.82	24595	880
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	НО	4/7/2022	1066	89	86.9	3.8	2.97	25017	919
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	НО	4/12/2022	180	89	86.5	4.1	3.27	28353	1067
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	НО	4/18/2022	365	89	84.9	4.3	3.41	21488	875
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	НО	4/25/2022	420	86	83.5	3.6	2.69	26442	929
RYAN HOLDEMAN	Jefferson	НО	4/20/2022	90	91	80.8	3.6	2.88	21181	819
JERRY SWAFFORD	Putnam	НО	4/26/2022	129	84	80	3.5	2.69	21010	778
OCMULGEE DAIRY	Houston	НО	4/28/2022	336	87	76.1	3.5	2.39	23804	835
BOB MOORE	Putnam	НО	4/14/2022	490	88	72.3	3.9	2.77	20432	856
RODNEY & CARLIN GIESBRECHT	Washington	НО	4/25/2022	425	91	71.7	3.8	2.64	22675	807
W.T.MERIWETHER	Morgan	НО	4/19/2022	72	85	71.1	3.5	2.18	19104	672
JAMES W MOON	Morgan	НО	4/14/2022	133	86	69.9	3.6	2.44	19908	754
DONALD NEWBERRY	Bibb	НО	4/1/2022	99	82	67.3	3.3	1.84	16103	549
HORST CREST FARMS	Burke	НО	3/30/2022	158	82	67	3.9	2.5	18894	719
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	JE	4/8/2022	35	82	65.3	5.4	2.72	16401	783

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>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 G	A DHI	A By Test Day	y Fat Prod	uction - April 2022					
			· · ·			t Day Av	<u>erage</u>		Yearly	Average
<u>Herd</u>	County	Br.	Test Date	1Cows	% in Milk	Milk	% Fat	TD Fat	<u>Milk</u>	Lbs. Fat
GODFREY DAIRY FARM*	Morgan	НО	4/4/2022	1193	89	103.9	4	3.84	31840	1249
WDAIRY LLC*	Morgan	XX	4/18/2022	1963	87	93.2	4.3	3.62	28980	1274
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	НО	4/18/2022	365	89	84.9	4.3	3.41	21488	875
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	НО	4/12/2022	180	89	86.5	4.1	3.27	28353	1067
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	НО	4/5/2022	310	89	91.9	3.8	3.23	29333	1203
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	НО	4/21/2022	718	90	92.2	3.6	3.12	29217	1084
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	НО	4/7/2022	1066	89	86.9	3.8	2.97	25017	919
RYAN HOLDEMAN	Jefferson	НО	4/20/2022	90	91	80.8	3.6	2.88	21181	819
TROY YODER	Macon	НО	3/31/2022	314	86	88.7	3.5	2.82	24595	880
BOB MOORE	Putnam	НО	4/14/2022	490	88	72.3	3.9	2.77	20432	856
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	JE	4/8/2022	35	82	65.3	5.4	2.72	16401	783
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	НО	4/25/2022	420	86	83.5	3.6	2.69	26442	929
JERRY SWAFFORD	Putnam	НО	4/26/2022	129	84	80	3.5	2.69	21010	778
RODNEY & CARLIN GIESBRECHT	Washington	НО	4/25/2022	425	91	71.7	3.8	2.64	22675	807
HORST CREST FARMS	Burke	НО	3/30/2022	158	82	67	3.9	2.5	18894	719
JAMES W MOON	Morgan	НО	4/14/2022	133	86	69.9	3.6	2.44	19908	754
OCMULGEE DAIRY	Houston	НО	4/28/2022	336	87	76.1	3.5	2.39	23804	835
ROGERS FARM SERVICES	Tattnall	XX	4/5/2022	149	86	55.4	4.6	2.27	15383	683
BUDDHA BELLY FARM LLC	Brooks	XX	4/2/2022	790	82	60.6	3.8	2.23	15490	611
W.T.MERIWETHER	Morgan	НО	4/19/2022	72	85	71.1	3.5	2.18	19104	672

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>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	Milk Prod	uction – May 2022					
	<del></del>				Tes	t Day Av	erage		Yearly	Average
<u>Herd</u>	County	<u>Br.</u>	Test Date	<sup>1</sup> Cows	% in Milk	Milk	% Fat	TD Fat	<u>Milk</u>	Lbs. Fat
GODFREY DAIRY FARM*	Morgan	НО	5/2/2022	1195	89	102.7	3.9	3.67	32035	1260
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	НО	5/20/2022	699	90	99	3.5	3.15	29352	1090
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	НО	5/10/2022	1081	89	91.1	3.5	2.82	25467	933
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	НО	5/3/2022	324	89	90.1	4	3.32	29377	1200
WDAIRY LLC*	Morgan	XX	5/23/2022	1928	87	89.8	4.5	3.6	29010	1277
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	НО	5/9/2022	183	89	86.9	3.8	3.09	28392	1072
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	НО	5/16/2022	368	89	86.6	4.3	3.43	21900	900
TROY YODER	Macon	НО	4/30/2022	318	87	85.6	3.7	2.94	24970	893
VISSCHER DAIRY LLC*	Jefferson	НО	5/4/2022	813	85	85.6	0	0	24957	429
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	НО	5/24/2022	415	87	84.5	3.5	2.69	26430	930
A & J DAIRY*	Wilkes	НО	5/11/2022	366	92	84	0	0	28044	0
RYAN HOLDEMAN	Jefferson	НО	4/20/2022	90	91	80.8	3.6	2.88	21181	819
OCMULGEE DAIRY	Houston	НО	5/26/2022	328	87	75.2	3.5	2.32	23751	832
JERRY SWAFFORD	Putnam	НО	5/19/2022	139	85	74.4	3.9	2.8	21184	786
JAMES W MOON	Morgan	НО	5/11/2022	129	87	69.1	3.5	2.34	20129	758
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	JE	5/6/2022	35	83	68	4.4	2.31	16912	810
BOB MOORE	Putnam	НО	5/9/2022	483	88	66.4	3.9	2.59	20564	857
W.T.MERIWETHER	Morgan	НО	5/12/2022	72	84	65.8	3.3	1.87	19047	672
ALEX MILLICAN	Walker	НО	4/15/2022	91	72	64.6	3.3	1.81	15928	523
RODNEY & CARLIN GIESBRECHT	Washington	НО	5/23/2022	412	91	64.3	3.9	2.5	22458	802

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>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	A DHIA	By Test Day	Fat Produ	iction – May 2022					
					<u>T</u> (	est Day Av	erage		Yearly	Average
<u>Herd</u>	County	<u>Br.</u>	Test Date	1Cows	% in Milk	<u>Milk</u>	% Fat	TD Fat	<u>Milk</u>	Lbs. Fat
GODFREY DAIRY FARM*	Morgan	НО	5/2/2022	1195	89	102.7	3.9	3.67	32035	1260
WDAIRY LLC*	Morgan	XX	5/23/2022	1928	87	89.8	4.5	3.6	29010	1277
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	НО	5/16/2022	368	89	86.6	4.3	3.43	21900	900
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	НО	5/3/2022	324	89	90.1	4	3.32	29377	1200
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	НО	5/20/2022	699	90	99	3.5	3.15	29352	1090
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	НО	5/9/2022	183	89	86.9	3.8	3.09	28392	1072
TROY YODER	Macon	НО	4/30/2022	318	87	85.6	3.7	2.94	24970	893
RYAN HOLDEMAN	Jefferson	НО	4/20/2022	90	91	80.8	3.6	2.88	21181	819
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	НО	5/10/2022	1081	89	91.1	3.5	2.82	25467	933
JERRY SWAFFORD	Putnam	НО	5/19/2022	139	85	74.4	3.9	2.8	21184	786
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	НО	5/24/2022	415	87	84.5	3.5	2.69	26430	930
BOB MOORE	Putnam	НО	5/9/2022	483	88	66.4	3.9	2.59	20564	857
RODNEY & CARLIN GIESBRECHT	Washington	НО	5/23/2022	412	91	64.3	3.9	2.5	22458	802
JAMES W MOON	Morgan	НО	5/11/2022	129	87	69.1	3.5	2.34	20129	758
OCMULGEE DAIRY	Houston	НО	5/26/2022	328	87	75.2	3.5	2.32	23751	832
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	JE	5/6/2022	35	83	68	4.4	2.31	16912	810
GRASSY FLATS	Brooks	XX	5/7/2022	737	83	56	4	2.18	17192	663
BUDDHA BELLY FARM LLC	Brooks	XX	5/9/2022	841	82	56.8	3.8	2.13	15419	608
HORST CREST FARMS	Burke	НО	5/26/2022	157	84	61.6	3.8	2.13	19036	725
ROGERS FARM SERVICES	Tattnall	XX	5/3/2022	139	86	52.9	4.3	2.08	15397	694

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>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).



	Тор	GA Low Hero	ds for S	CC – TD	Average Score -	- March 2022			
<u>Herd</u>	County	Test Date	<u>Br.</u>	1Cows	Milk-Rolling	SCC-TD- Average Score	SCC-TD- Weight Average	SCC- Average Score	SCC- Wt.
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	3/7/2022	НО	189	28368	1.3	54	1.6	82
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	3/8/2022	JE	34	16189	1.6	48	1.8	101
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	3/8/2022	НО	1063	24703	1.8	122	2.1	167
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	3/1/2022	НО	327	29257	2	131	2	133
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	3/18/2022	НО	364	21555	2.1	125	2.6	232
SCHAAPMAN HOLSTEINS*	Wilcox	3/20/2022	НО	718	29233	2.1	151	2.5	212
GODFREY DAIRY FARM*	Morgan	3/7/2022	НО	1204	31558	2.1	199	2.2	189
WDAIRY LLC*	Morgan	3/21/2022	XX	1997	28897	2.2	191	2.1	160
RODNEY & CARLIN GIESBRECHT	Washington	3/21/2022	НО	397	22727	2.2	203	2.6	256
ALBERT HALE	Oconee	2/28/2022	НО	76	12146	2.3	244	2.8	241
RYAN HOLDEMAN	Jefferson	3/16/2022	НО	96	20695	2.4	201	2.4	175
JAMES W MOON	Morgan	3/9/2022	НО	132	19599	2.5	159	2.7	255
HORST CREST FARMS	Burke	2/24/2022	НО	153	18734	2.5	183	3.1	270
UNIV OF GA DAIRY FARM	Clarke	2/24/2022	XX	140	20754	2.6	229	2.2	212
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	3/24/2022	НО	438	26598	2.6	255	2.4	224
FRANKS FARM	Burke	3/15/2022	BS	181	18888	2.6	279	2.3	183
JERRY SWAFFORD	Putnam	3/23/2022	НО	139	20725	2.7	204	2.9	189
BOB MOORE	Putnam	3/22/2022	НО	502	20354	3.2	230	3.2	278
ROGERS FARM SERVICES	Tattnall	3/8/2022	XX	147	15455	3.3	328	3.5	361
W.T.MERIWETHER	Morgan	3/23/2022	НО	76	19247	3.4	338	3.1	320

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>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 Low Herds for SCC -TD Average Score - April 2022											
<u>Herd</u>	County	Test Date	Br.	1Cows	Milk-Rolling	SCC-TD- Average Score	SCC-TD- Weight Average	SCC- Average Score	SCC- Wt.		
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	4/8/2022	JE	35	16401	1.5	59	1.7	97		
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	4/12/2022	НО	180	28353	1.6	89	1.6	82		
ALEX MILLICAN	Walker	4/15/2022	НО	91	15928	2	136	2.2	193		
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	4/5/2022	НО	310	29333	2	146	2	136		
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	4/7/2022	НО	1066	25017	2.1	156	2	161		
RYAN HOLDEMAN	Jefferson	4/20/2022	НО	90	21181	2.1	208	2.3	183		
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	4/18/2022	НО	365	21488	2.2	102	2.5	221		
DONALD NEWBERRY	Bibb	4/1/2022	НО	99	16103	2.3	133	2.7	259		
TROY YODER	Macon	3/31/2022	НО	314	24595	2.3	175	2.7	180		
ALBERT HALE	Oconee	4/4/2022	НО	72	12525	2.3	207	2.7	240		
FRANKS FARM	Burke	4/19/2022	BS	185	18771	2.3	211	2.3	190		
GODFREY DAIRY FARM*	Morgan	4/4/2022	НО	1193	31840	2.3	222	2.2	194		
WDAIRY LLC*	Morgan	4/18/2022	XX	1963	28980	2.4	193	2.2	165		
UNIV OF GA DAIRY FARM	Clarke	3/31/2022	XX	145	20448	2.4	206	2.3	221		
RODNEY & CARLIN GIESBRECHT	Washington	4/25/2022	НО	425	22675	2.6	289	2.6	257		
JAMES W MOON	Morgan	4/14/2022	НО	133	19908	2.7	215	2.7	259		
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	4/25/2022	НО	420	26442	2.8	283	2.5	233		
HORST CREST FARMS	Burke	3/30/2022	НО	158	18894	2.9	228	3.1	263		
JERRY SWAFFORD	Putnam	4/26/2022	НО	129	21010	3	214	2.9	189		
GRASSY FLATS	Brooks	4/8/2022	XX	784	17497	3.1	318	3	304		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>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 Low Herds for SCC -TD Average Score - May 2022											
<u>Herd</u>	County	Test Date	Br.	<sup>1</sup> Cows	Milk-Rolling	SCC-TD- Average Score	SCC-TD- Weight Average	SCC- Average Score	SCC- Wt.		
BERRY COLLEGE DAIRY	Floyd	5/6/2022	JE	35	16912	1.5	51	1.7	82		
SCOTT GLOVER	Hall	5/9/2022	НО	183	28392	1.5	81	1.5	83		
EBERLY FAMILY FARM	Burke	5/10/2022	НО	1081	25467	1.8	128	2	158		
DANNY BELL*	Morgan	5/3/2022	НО	324	29377	1.8	139	1.9	134		
ALEX MILLICAN	Walker	4/15/2022	НО	91	15928	2	136	2.2	193		
GODFREY DAIRY FARM*	Morgan	5/2/2022	НО	1195	32035	2	193	2.2	195		
MARTIN DAIRY L. L. P.	Hart	5/16/2022	НО	368	21900	2.1	173	2.5	215		
RYAN HOLDEMAN	Jefferson	4/20/2022	НО	90	21181	2.1	208	2.3	183		
UNIV OF GA DAIRY FARM	Clarke	4/27/2022	XX	135	20209	2.2	119	2.3	216		
JERRY SWAFFORD	Putnam	5/19/2022	НО	139	21184	2.3	153	2.8	189		
JAMES W MOON	Morgan	5/11/2022	НО	129	20129	2.5	163	2.7	258		
DOUG CHAMBERS	Jones	5/24/2022	НО	415	26430	2.5	249	2.5	237		
RODNEY & CARLIN GIESBRECHT	Washington	5/23/2022	НО	412	22458	2.5	264	2.6	261		
TROY YODER	Macon	4/30/2022	НО	318	24970	2.6	173	2.7	178		
WDAIRY LLC*	Morgan	5/23/2022	XX	1928	29010	2.6	244	2.2	171		
ALBERT HALE	Oconee	5/2/2022	НО	72	12784	2.7	177	2.7	240		
HORST CREST FARMS	Burke	5/26/2022	НО	157	19036	2.8	237	3	260		
GRASSY FLATS	Brooks	5/7/2022	XX	737	17192	2.8	247	3.1	311		
W.T.MERIWETHER	Morgan	5/12/2022	НО	72	19047	2.8	265	3.1	317		
ROGERS FARM SERVICES	Tattnall	5/3/2022	XX	139	15397	3	303	3.4	363		



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>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).