



*Department of Animal and Range Sciences, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT 59717; †Northern Agricultural Research Center, Montana State University, Havre, MT 59501

Objectives

- Assess how cow weaning weight ratio and cow weight (BW) effect:
 - winter grazing behavior
 - winter supplement intake
 - winter rangeland resource use
 - feed intake
 - milk production

Reasoning

- The ideal cow would convert forage compared greater pounds calf weaned and optim distribution (Stewart and Martin, 1983; Scasta et
- Metrics that accurately identify cattle end extensive rangeland systems are neede Brown, 1978; Beck et al., 2016)
- The ratio of calf weight weaned to cow accurate estimate of cow efficiency (Dinl 1978; Scasta et al., 2015)
- According to NRC Beef Cattle Nutrition small cattle eat less than large cattle 2015; NASEM, 2016)
- o Milk yield and constituents influence weaning ADG (Totusek et al., 1973; Mondrago Beal et al., 1990)



uestions? Please feel free to contact! Alyson Williams alysonrose@gorge.net

The influence of beef cow weaning weight ratio and cow size on winter grazing distribution, feed and supplement intake behavior, and milk production A. R. Williams,* S. A. Wyffles,* C. T. Parsons,[†] J. M. Dafoe,[†] D. L. Boss,[†] J. G. P. Bowman,* B. F. Sowell,* and T. DelCurto*

Methods

o (WWR)	 Four classification groups with 10 cows per group 1. High WWR (56%) – light BW (1107 lbs) 2. High WWR (53%) – heavy BW (1208 lbs) 3. Low WWR (42%) – light BW (1316 lbs) 4. Low WWR (42%) – heavy BW (1415 lbs)
	 Classification groups determined by individua lifetime average weaning weight ratio and li average body weight
	 All cows had weaned at least 3 calves prior
onsumed to nize grazing al., 2015) efficiency in ed (Dinkel and weight is an kel and Brown,	 Winter grazing trial (Dec 1, 2016 to Jan 15, 2017 and Nov 1 to 2017) Grazing distribution Lotek 3300LR GPS collars Supplement intake SmartFeedPro electronic feed bunks CHS 30% protein, fully-fortified, pellet Spring feedlot trial (May 2 to 23, 2017 and May 1 to 22, 2018) Feed intake SmartFeedPro electronic feed bunks CHS 15% protein, fully-fortified, grass/alfalfa pellet
(Walker et al.,	 Milk yield and constituents
e calf pre-	 Weigh-suckle-weigh protocol 100 ml milk sample collections
	Future Analyses
	 Resource use models for each classification gr
	 Habitat selection preterence between groups
	 Resource attributes that best describes areas areas

	Percent of 24-h Period Spent at Distance from										
Supplement (Year 1)											
	100.00% -	0.72%	0.93%	0.93%	1.66%						
Hour Period	90.00%	11.11%	16.67%	00 05Ø	9.58%						
	80.00%			<i>LL.LJ/</i> 0							
	70.00%	41 5007			42.94%						
	60.00%	40.37%	43.74%	39.09%	-	0.75-1 mi					
	50.00% -					0.5-0.75 mi					
	40.00%					0.25-0.5 mi					
24	30.00%					0 0120 1111					
	20.00% -	41.58%	38.66%	37.73%	45.82%						
	10.00%										
	0.00%										
		High-Light	High-Heavy Classificatio	Low-Light on Groups	Low-Heavy						

Figure 1. Percent of a 24-h period spent at distances of 0-0.25, 0.25-0.5, 0.5-0.75, and 0.75-1 mile from supplement locations between two cows from each classification group for year 1 (45-d study).

) cows per group W (1107 lbs) BW (1208 lbs) W (1316 lbs) BW (1415 lbs) ned by individual cow

reight ratio and lifetime

calves prior

Jan 15, 2017 and Nov 1 to Dec 31,

Table 1. Feed intake and milk performance trial results from year 1.											
	High	n WWR	Low	WWR	_	WWR	BW	WWR*BW			
Item	Light	Heavy	Light	Heavy	SE	P-value	P-value	P-value			
Intake											
Daily, Ib	40.1	45.9	38.8	46.5	2.14	0.98	< 0.01	0.69			
Daily, % of BW	3.4	3.6ª	2.8 ^b	3.3	0.16	< 0.02	<0.06	0.42			
Milk yield											
Yield, lb	4.6	5.3	3.1	4.4	0.62	<0.08	0.11	0.45			
Yield, % of BW	0.39	0.41ª	0.20 ^b	0.30	0.05	< 0.01	0.25	0.40			
^{a,b,c,d} Means within a row with different superscripts differ ($P \le 0.05$)											

- BW more than light cows (P < 0.06)
- WWR cows (P < 0.02)
- than low WWR cows (P < 0.01)
- (P < 0.05)

feed bunks

tified, grass/alfalfa pellet

CO tions

lyses

h classification group

ce between groups

est describes areas of use



Supplement Intake Year 1



Supplement Intake Year 2 P = 0.74P = 0.73~ 220() € 2000 ⊕ 1800 <u>0</u> 1600 5 1200 1000 800 600 \mathbf{S} 400 High-Light High-Heavy Low-Light Low-Heavy Hiah-Liaht High-Heavy Low-Liaht Low-Heavy Classification Groups **Classification Groups**

Figure 2. Supplement intake between the four classification groups for year 1 (45-d study) and year 2 (60-d study) represented in pounds with standard error bars.

- was better than for low WWR cows
- production systems

Conclusions

• Heavy cows ate 6.7 lbs daily (P < 0.01) and 0.4% of

C-LOCH

CHS)

USDA

Nancy Cameron

The Bair Ranch

Foundation

Endowment SARE

• High WWR cows ate 0.4% of BW more than low

• High WWR cows produced 0.15% of BW more milk

• High WWR cows consumed 0.08% of BW more supplement per day than low WWR cows in year 2

Implications

 High WWR cows consumed more feed when compared on a percent of body weight basis, however, when calf weight weaned was considered the ratio between calf weight and feed consumed

 Smaller cows may wean smaller calves but they consume much less feed than large cows

 Provide additional knowledge for the discussion of what type of cow is more suited to western rangeland