

1-1-2001

# The Effect of Feeding Pressed Sugar Beet Pulp in Beef Cattle Feedlot Finishing Diets

Jessica Park

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

Ivan G. Rush

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln, irush1@unl.edu*

Burt Weichenthal

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln, bweich@comcast.net*

Todd Milton

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/animalscinbcr>



Part of the [Animal Sciences Commons](#)

---

Park, Jessica; Rush, Ivan G.; Weichenthal, Burt; and Milton, Todd, "The Effect of Feeding Pressed Sugar Beet Pulp in Beef Cattle Feedlot Finishing Diets" (2001). *Nebraska Beef Cattle Reports*. 312.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/animalscinbcr/312>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Animal Science Department at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Nebraska Beef Cattle Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

when heifers were implanted with Synovex Plus with or without MGA supplementation, respectively, compared to Finaplix-H with MGA supplementation. When carcass discounts and premiums were applied to calculate profit(loss), heifers implanted with Synovex Plus without MGA supplementation were similar to those implanted with Finaplix-H and fed MGA. The reductions in percentage of cattle grading low Choice in this experiment were large enough, using a \$10 Choice/Select spread, to offset the advantage in cost of gain. Although not statistically different, the incidence of dark cutting

carcasses was included in this calculation at a discount of \$30/cwt. The additive effect of implanting heifers with Synovex Plus and feeding MGA increased carcass merit returns ( $P < .09$ ) by \$10.95 per head compared to the Finaplix-H, MGA fed heifers.

In experiment 2, cost of gain was not significantly influenced by implant treatment. Overall profit(loss) tended (live basis,  $P = .23$ ; carcass basis,  $P = .19$ ) to be greater for heifers implanted with Synovex Plus.

These data suggest that Synovex Plus can be used in feedlot heifers to enhance daily gain and improve net live

basis profit(loss) compared with a implant program using Finaplix-H. Carcass quality is similar between heifers implanted with Synovex Plus or Finaplix-H when MGA is included in the diet, increasing overall net carcass merit profit(loss) in Synovex Plus heifers.

---

<sup>1</sup>Casey Macken, graduate student; Todd Milton, assistant professor, Animal Science, Lincoln; Bill Dicke, Cattlemen's Consulting, Lincoln; Dave McClellan, McClellan Consulting, Fremont; Frank Prouty, Fort Dodge Animal Health, Overland Park, KS.

---

# The Effect of Feeding Pressed Sugar Beet Pulp in Beef Cattle Feedlot Finishing Diets

Jessica Park  
Ivan Rush  
Todd Milton  
Burt Weichenthal<sup>1</sup>

## Introduction

Sugar beet pulp is a byproduct of the sugar beet industry. After the sugar is extracted from the beet, the remaining fraction is mechanically pressed to around 24% dry matter. The pulp can be fed fresh or ensiled, allowing it to be accessible year round. Previous studies have shown that replacing corn silage dry matter with increasing levels of beet pulp have improved average daily gain and feed efficiency in growing beef cattle diets (1992 Nebraska Beef Report, pp. 24-25, 1993 Nebraska Beef Report, pp. 48-49, 2000 Nebraska Beef Report, pp. 36-37). Replacing all of the corn silage in the diet (10% diet dry matter) with beet pulp resulted in similar daily gains and a trend toward improved feed efficiency in a feedlot finishing diet (1993 Nebraska Beef Report, pp. 48-49). The NDF and ADF of beet pulp (54% and 33%, respectively) are similar to those of corn silage (51% and 28%, respectively). Beet pulp has a highly digestible fiber fraction, and is therefore considered to be both an energy and roughage source in beef cattle diets. Because of similar energy values, the costs are usually comparable on a dry matter basis. However, little is known how or if beet

pulp functions as a roughage source in the diet. Therefore, the objective of this experiment was to determine if beet pulp could replace corn silage (DM basis) as a fiber source in a feedlot finishing diet.

## Procedure

Two groups of British crossbred yearling steers were used in separate trials in a complete randomized design. In Trial 1, 118 steers (initial BW 1030 lb) were assigned randomly to one of 12 pens with nine or 10 steers per pen. Pens then were assigned randomly to one of three dietary treatments, with four replicates per treatment. All steers were fed for 77 days. In Trial 2, 90 steers (initial BW 859 lb) were assigned randomly to one of nine pens with 10 steers per pen. Pens were then randomly assigned to dietary treatment as in Trial 1. There were 3 replicates per treatment and steers were fed for 133 days.

In both trials, steers were individually weighed for two consecutive days at the initiation of the trial and every 28 days throughout the feeding period. The three diet treatments (Table 1) on a DM basis were: 8.5% corn silage (CON), 8.5% beet pulp (8.5BP), and 12.5% beet

(Continued on next page)

Feeding pressed beet pulp in place of corn silage in a finishing diet resulted in equal feed efficiencies though dry matter intake was slightly affected.

## Summary

*Two trials were conducted to evaluate feeding pressed beet pulp as the roughage source in finishing diets. British crossbred steers were fed 8.5% corn silage, 8.5% beet pulp, or 12.5% beet pulp with the remainder of the diet consisting of dry rolled corn and supplement. When the two trials were analyzed together, average daily gain was higher in the corn silage treatment compared to the two levels of beet pulp. However, feed to gain conversions between the treatments were not different. Beet pulp can serve as a substitute for corn silage and even though dry matter intake may be slightly affected, feed efficiency will be equal.*

pulp (12.5BP). The 8.5% beet pulp treatment replaced the 8.5% corn silage on a one to one basis. The 12.5% beet pulp treatment had the same level of NDF as that supplied by the 8.5% corn silage treatment. The remainder of the diets consisted of dry rolled corn and protein supplement. The diets were formulated to be isonitrogenous at 13% CP. In Trial 1, the beet pulp was stored on a concrete pad for several months prior to the trial, while it was fed fresh in Trial 2. Steers were implanted with Revalor S at the beginning of the finishing period. Carcass characteristics were taken at the time of slaughter. Final weights, used to calculate ADG and feed to gain, were calculated from hot carcass weight (HCW) adjusted to a common dressing percentage (62%). Performance data were analyzed using the GLM procedures of SAS with feedlot pen as the experimental unit. Quality grades were analyzed using the chi-square procedure of SAS. Significance was determined at  $P = .10$  unless otherwise specified.

## Results

Steer performance is shown in Table 2. Data were tested for treatment by trial interactions. There was no treatment by trial interaction for ADG ( $P = .18$ ). Gains were higher in the CON treatment compared to the 8.5BP and 12.5BP treatments ( $P = .05$ ). A significant trial by treatment interaction ( $P = .08$ ) occurred for DMI, therefore dry matter intakes are reported within trial. In Trial 1, cattle consuming CON had a higher DMI (26.2 vs. 23.5 and 23.6, for CON, 8.5BP, and 12.5BP, respectively;  $P < .001$ ) than steers fed the pulp rations, but no differences in DMI between the 8.5BP and the 12.5BP treatments occurred. In Trial 2, no differences in DMI across the treatments were indicated. The different responses observed for DMI as beet pulp replaced corn silage in the diet may have been due to the storage of the beet pulp. In Trial 1, the beet pulp was ensiled for several months prior to feeding and in Trial 2 the pulp was fed fresh. There was not a significant treatment by trial interaction ( $P = .96$ ) in feed conversion. Therefore, data were pooled and no differences in

**Table 1. Diet dry matter composition and calculated nutrient analysis.**

	Treatment <sup>a</sup>		
	CON	8.5BP	12.5BP
Diet composition, dry matter basis, %			
Corn silage	8.5	0	0
Beet pulp	0	8.5	12.5
Dry rolled corn	82.7	83.3	79.5
Protein supplement 58 <sup>b</sup>	6.4	6.4	6.4
Protein supplement 40 <sup>c</sup>	2.5	1.8	1.7
Calculated nutrient composition, dry matter basis			
Dry matter, %	76.3	70.7	65.4
Crude protein, %	13.0	13.0	13.0
NEm, Mcal/cwt	92.7	93.6	93.2
NEg, Mcal/cwt	63.6	63.6	63.2
Rumensin, g/ton	29.0	29.0	29.0

<sup>a</sup>CON = Dry-rolled corn control with 8.5% corn silage; 8.5BP = 8.5% beet pulp replacing corn silage; 12.5BP = 12.5% beet pulp replacing corn silage and dry rolled corn.

<sup>b</sup>Supplement contains 58 percent crude protein, with Rumensin at 420g/ton, air dry basis.

<sup>c</sup>Supplement contains 40 percent crude protein, air dry basis.

**Table 2. Performance of steers in trial 1 and trial 2 fed dry-rolled corn based finishing diets with corn silage or wet beet pulp as the roughage source.**

	Treatment <sup>a</sup>		
	CON	8.5BP	12.5BP
DMI, lb/day <sup>b</sup>			
Trial 1	26.2 <sup>c</sup>	23.4 <sup>d</sup>	23.6 <sup>d</sup>
Trial 2	22.9	23.3	22.4
ADG, lb/day	3.44 <sup>e</sup>	3.18 <sup>d</sup>	3.19 <sup>d</sup>
Feed/gain	7.17	7.41	7.26

<sup>a</sup>CON = dry-rolled corn control with 8.5% corn silage; 8.5BP = 8.5% beet pulp replacing corn silage; 12.5BP = 12.5% beet pulp replacing corn silage and dry-rolled corn.

<sup>b</sup>Significant treatment x trial interaction ( $P = .08$ ).

<sup>c,d</sup>Means within the same row bearing different superscripts differ ( $P < .05$ ).

**Table 3. Carcass characteristics of steers fed dry-rolled corn based finishing diets with corn silage or wet beet pulp as the roughage source.**

	Treatment <sup>a</sup>		
	CON	8.5BP	12.5BP
Trial 1 and Trial 2			
Hot carcass weight, lb	812 <sup>b</sup>	796 <sup>c</sup>	799 <sup>c</sup>
Backfat, in	.39 <sup>d</sup>	.38 <sup>e</sup>	.38 <sup>e</sup>
Ribeye area, in <sup>2</sup>	13.2	13.1	13.1
Marbling score <sup>f</sup>	5.27 <sup>d</sup>	4.84 <sup>e</sup>	5.11 <sup>de</sup>
Yield grade <sup>g</sup>	2.74	2.68	2.68
U.S.D.A. Choice or above, % <sup>h</sup>	59	43	59

<sup>a</sup>CON = dry-rolled corn control with 8.5% corn silage; 8.5BP = 8.5% beet pulp replacing corn silage; 12.5BP = 12.5% beet pulp replacing corn silage and dry-rolled corn.

<sup>b,c</sup>Means on same row with different superscripts are different ( $P < .10$ ).

<sup>d,e</sup>Means on same row with different superscripts are different ( $P < .05$ ).

<sup>f</sup>Slight 0 = 4.0, Slight 50 = 4.5, Small 0 = 5.0, Small 50 = 5.5, etc.

<sup>g</sup>Yield grade =  $2.5 + (2.5 * \text{backfat}) + (.0038 * \text{hot carcass weight}) + (.2 * \text{kidney-pelvic-heart fat}) - (.32 * \text{ribeye area})$ .

<sup>h</sup>Chi-square statistic ( $P = .09$ ).

feed conversion between the three treatments were detected. Beet pulp can effectively replace corn silage in a finishing diet and it appears that the feeding value is similar (DM basis).

Carcass data are shown in Table 3. There were no treatment by trial interac-

tions ( $P > .10$ ) for carcass characteristics, therefore data were pooled. Hot carcass weights were higher for the CON treatment ( $P < .10$ ). The CON treatment had higher marbling scores compared to 8.5BP ( $P < .05$ ), but it was not different from 12.5BP. Backfat was higher in the

CON treatment compared to the two levels of beet pulp ( $P < .05$ ). No differences between treatments for ribeye area or yield grade were found. Quality grades were analyzed by chi-square distribution. The percent grading Choice or above varied by treatment ( $P = .09$ ).

Feed conversions between the corn silage and beet pulp diets were similar. There was a difference in DMI between the CON and beet pulp treatments,

although when the two levels of beet pulp were compared, they were not different. Beet pulp can serve as a replacement for corn silage in finishing diets and it has a similar feeding value. In this experiment, dry matter intake was slightly affected, however feed efficiency was not different when beet pulp was fed. These results agree with those reported in the 1993 Nebraska Beef Report (pp. 48-49) where daily gains and feed con-

versions were not different when 10% corn silage was replaced with 10% beet pulp on a DM basis in a finishing diet.

---

<sup>1</sup>Jessica Park, graduate student; Ivan Rush and Burt Weichenthal, professors, Animal Science, Panhandle Research and Extension Center, Scottsbluff; Todd Milton, assistant professor, Animal Science, Lincoln.

---

# Effects of Feeding Regimen on Performance, Behavior and Body Temperature of Feedlot Steers

Shane Davis  
Terry Mader  
Simone Holt  
Wanda Cerkoney<sup>1</sup>

Changing feeding regimen of feedlot animals during potential heat stress periods can effectively lower body temperature, thus decreasing the risk of possible heat related production losses.

## Summary

*One hundred forty-four predominantly Angus x Charolais steers were used to determine effects of different feeding regimens on performance, behavior and tympanic temperatures of steers under environmental heat stress. Steers were assigned to one of three treatments: 1) ad libitum fed at 0800 hr (ADLIB); 2) fed at 1600 hr with bunks slick by 0800 hr (BKMGT); and 3) fed 85% of predicted DMI at 1600 hr (LIMFD). Treatments were imposed for 23 days after which all steers were allowed ad libitum access to feed at 0800 hr. Overall performance was not affected by treatment. Altering feed time and amount reduced tympanic temperature and altered eating pattern.*

## Introduction

Daily feed intake contributes to the metabolic heat load of animals. When animals are presented with adverse climatic conditions consisting of elevated ambient temperature, relative humidity, and solar radiation, they may be unable to effectively dissipate metabolic heat load. Altering feeding regimen during times of potential heat stress may be beneficial in maintaining overall performance.

Possible strategies for altering the timing or reducing the peak metabolic heat load include adjusting the time of feed consumption and limit-feeding, respectively. Research has shown limit-feeding may reduce metabolic rate and improve overall efficiency when cattle are subsequently provided ad libitum access to feed. The objectives of our study were to determine effects of altered feeding regimen on performance and changes in eating behavior of feedlot steers during potential heat stress periods. Additionally, tympanic temperatures of the steers were monitored under both thermoneutral and hot environmental conditions to determine alterations in body temperature in response to altered feeding regimen.

## Procedure

One-hundred forty-four Angus x Charolais steers were used. Upon initiation of the trial steers were implanted with Synovex-Plus® with average body weight on two consecutive days serving as initial weight. Steers were blocked by color (black or white) and randomly assigned to one of 24 pens. All steers were fed a 65 Mcal/cwt NEg ration consisting of (DM basis): 84% dry rolled corn, 7.5% alfalfa hay, 4.5% liquid supplement, 2% soybean meal and 2% dry supplement. Treatments were assigned to pens and consisted of: 1) ad libitum feeding at 0800 hr (ADLIB); 2) bunk management, feed delivered at 1600 h and managed to be empty by 0800 hr (BKMGT); and 3) limit-fed, delivered 85% of predicted DMI at 1600 hr (LIMFD). Treatments were initiated on day 0 (June 23, 1999) and imposed for 23 days (managed feeding phase), then all animals were allowed *ad libitum* access to feed delivered at 0800 hr.

Daily feed and water intakes were recorded. Body weights were obtained on days 23 and at the termination of the trial (day 82; Sept. 13, 1999). On day 83 steers were transported to a commercial slaughter facility. Hot carcass weight, fat thickness, marbling score, and yield

(Continued on next page)