

SweetPro Tubs and Molasses Tubs Evaluated

Summary of University of Georgia Feed Trial * Alapaha Experiment Station, Tifton, GA Winter 2010/11

The winter feeding portion of the research trial was conducted from December 15, 2010 to March 15, 2011 at the University of Georgia's Alapaha Experiment Station at Tifton, GA.

Each treatment had 20 cows split into two groups.

Research conducted by the University of Georgia has shown a marked difference between supplementing Beef Cows with SweetPro Feed's distillers-grain-based tub versus a traditional molasses tub.

Daily intake of the molasses tub was 46% higher than the SweetPro tub (1.65 lbs vs. 0.89 lb) and average daily hay consumption was 17% higher for the molasses fed cows (47.1 lbs vs. 42.0) yet the cow-condition was better with the SweetPro / Distillers supplement. Cows on the molasses tubs lost 54 pounds more than the SweetPro supplemented cows over the initial 90-days of the trial which included delivering a 90 pound calf (-135 vs -81).

The trial, which will examine other factors over a full year, also included a treatment with several pounds of whole cotton seed (WCS) being put out each day and also a treatment with only hay and mineral.

Compared to the hay-only group, the SweetPro group had lower hay intake (42.0 lbs vs. 43.6) and less weight loss (81 vs. 103 lbs). Compared to the daily supplemented whole cottonseed group, the SweetPro group had slightly higher total feed intake (42.9 vs. 42.0) and higher weight loss (81 vs. 47 lbs) but lower day-cost for supplement (\$ 0.29 vs. \$ 0.58*) and minimal labor versus daily feeding of WCS.

*January 2011 average whole cotton seed (WCS) price, \$220/ton F.O.B. Atlanta, GA, per Feedstuffs Magazine.

Feed	WCS	SweetPro	Molasses	Hay Only	
Hay/hd/day, lbs	36.6	42.0	47.1	43.9	
Supplement Intake, lbs	5.30	0.89	1.65	0	
Free choice mineral, lbs	0.11	0.08	0.14	0.30	
Total Feed Intake, lbs	42.0	42.9	48.9	44.0	
Weight change after 90 # calf, lbs	-49	-81	-135	-103	
Dietary Ingredient Cost, \$/d	Feed Cost/d, \$				
Hay Cost, \$/lb	\$ 0.05	1.83	2.10	2.36	2.19
Mineral, \$/lb	\$ 0.49	0.05	0.04	0.07	0.15
Supplement 1 WCS, \$/lb	\$ 0.11	0.58			
Supplement 2 SweetPro, \$/lb	\$ 0.33	0.29			
Supplement 3 Molasses, \$/lb	\$ 0.31		0.51		
Total, \$/d	2.47	2.43	2.93	2.34	
Pregnancy after 70-d breeding period, %	95.4	95.4	92.3	81.0	
Estimated fetal age	70.2	81.0	82.5	86.8	

Company president, Robert Thornberg, Walhalla, ND, commented on the stark differences between SweetPro and molasses tubs by saying, "this illustrates the 'negative associative affect' pasture cattle must overcome with sugar and starch. Whenever cattle get a load of molasses sugar or grain, their rumen has to adjust. It takes different microbes to process the starch and sugar, and those 'bugs' lower the pH. Cattle try to buffer the rumen back to normal by eating more hay. However, with the fermented 'no-starch/no-sugar' focus of SweetPro tubs, rumen pH is stable, so fiber-digesting microbes flourish and cattle get more out of their hay." Thornberg went on to add that, "for less than 10-cents/d over the cost of the hay-only treatment, one can supplement cows with SweetPro tubs to assure healthier calves, plus much better breed-back for cows."

The winter feeding program of the research trial was conducted from December 15, 2010 at the University of Georgia's Alapaha Experiment Station at Tifton, GA. Each treatment had 20 cows split into two groups.