

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Nebraska Beef Cattle Reports

Animal Science Department

---

January 2000

## Effects of Programmed Gain Feeding Strategies on Performance and Carcass Characteristics of Yearling Steers

Tony Scott

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

Todd Milton

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

Terry J. Klopfenstein

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, tklopfenstein1@unl.edu

Terry L. Mader

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, tmader1@unl.edu

Simone Holt

*University of Queensland-Gatton, Gatton, Queensland, Australia*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/animalscibcr>



Part of the [Animal Sciences Commons](#)

---

Scott, Tony; Milton, Todd; Klopfenstein, Terry J.; Mader, Terry L.; and Holt, Simone, "Effects of Programmed Gain Feeding Strategies on Performance and Carcass Characteristics of Yearling Steers" (2000). *Nebraska Beef Cattle Reports*. 390.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/animalscibcr/390>

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.

acid-resistant *E. coli* counts. Similarly, limit-feeding of the finishing diets did not alter acid-resistant *E. coli* numbers in comparison to ad libitum feeding. Potentially, one could limit intake more and possibly reduce acid-resistant *E. coli*; however, the reduced intake would impact daily gain and potentially carcass merit.

## Experiment 2

The effect of switching steers to alfalfa hay for five days is shown in Table 3. Total *E. coli* counts were similar among treatments; however, counts were reduced from previously observed counts in Period 3 by .5, 1.27, and 1.16 log<sub>10</sub> units for DRC, HMC, and WCGF, respectively. Similarly, there were no differences in acid-resistant *E. coli* counts among the treatments; however, counts were reduced from those previously observed in Period 3 by 2.35, 2.58, and 3.01 log<sub>10</sub> units for

DRC, HMC, and WCGF, respectively. These numbers indicate irrespective of diet, acid-resistant *E. coli* numbers were reduced when steers were fed alfalfa hay ad libitum for a period of five days.

Since there were no significant differences among DRC, HMC, or WCGF finishing diets when switched to alfalfa hay feeding, data were pooled to illustrate the effect of feeding alfalfa hay versus feeding finishing diets on the MPN of total and acid-resistant *E. coli* and colonic pH (Table 4). Switching steers to alfalfa hay lowered ( $P < .01$ ) both total and acid-resistant *E. coli*. Total *E. coli* numbers were lowered by about 1 log<sub>10</sub> unit while acid-resistant *E. coli* numbers were lowered by about 2.5 log<sub>10</sub> units. Colonic pH was increased ( $P < .01$ ) by over 1 pH unit in response to hay feeding. These data indicate short-duration hay feeding reduced acid-resistant *E. coli* populations in the feces by over 99%.

Dietary manipulation of finishing diets either by substituting ingredients or limit-feeding successfully increased colonic pH, indicating substrate changes at the level of the colon; however, increased colonic pH was not associated with reduced populations of acid-resistant *E. coli*. Feeding alfalfa hay both increased colonic pH and decreased acid-resistant *E. coli*. This study confirms Diez-Gonzalez (1998) report that feeding hay for a short duration can reduce acid-resistant *E. coli* populations.

<sup>1</sup>Tony Scott, Casey Wilson, research technicians, Animal Science, Lincoln; Doreen Bailey, research technician, Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences, Lincoln; Terry Klopfenstein, Professor, Todd Milton, Assistant Professor, Animal Science, Lincoln. Rod Moxley, Professor, Dave Smith, Jeff Gray, Assistant Professors, Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences, Lincoln; Laura Hungerford, Associate Professor, Great Plains Veterinary Educational Center, Clay Center.

# Effects of Programmed Gain Feeding Strategies on Performance and Carcass Characteristics of Yearling Steers

**Tony Scott**  
**Todd Milton**  
**Terry Mader**  
**Terry Klopfenstein**  
**Simone Holt<sup>1</sup>**

Programming gain for the first 21 or 42 days of the feeding period reduced the total amount of feed consumed but did not improve cumulative performance compared with ad libitum feeding.

## Summary

Two hundred forty-five crossbred yearling steers were used in a randomized complete block design to determine effects of including a programmed gain phase in the feeding period on

*performance and carcass characteristics. Including a programmed gain phase in the finishing period resulted in similar cumulative daily gains and feed conversions when compared with steers allowed to consume feed ad libitum. Programming gain reduced the total amount of feed consumed per animal; however, the lack of an improvement in feed conversion coupled with slight numerical differences in hot carcass weights resulted in net profits favoring ad libitum feeding.*

## Introduction

Previous research regarding controlling intake during the finishing period has focused on maintaining a static intake relative to ad libitum fed control pens. Improvements in efficiency have been demonstrated; however, daily gain

may decrease, resulting in increased days on feed. Recent studies (Knoblich, et al., 1997, J. Anim. Sci., 75:3094; Loerch and Fluharty, 1998, J. Anim. Sci., 76:371) have shown similar daily gains, hot carcass weights and days on feed. At the same time, reductions in the amount of feed consumed result in improvements in efficiency.

Currently research on controlling intake during the finishing period has shifted toward programmed gain systems. Programmed gain systems are based on the net energy equations in the NRC (1996). Based on the diet being fed, a programmed rate of gain is selected and the amount of feed required to achieve the programmed rate of gain can be calculated.

In a previous study (1999 Nebraska Beef Report, pp 46-48), programmed

(Continued on next page)

**Table 1. Composition of finishing diet.**

Ingredient	% of diet DM
Dry-rolled corn	49
Wet corn gluten feed	40
Corn silage	8
Dry supplement	3

gain strategies were investigated in calves. Since yearlings tend to consume large quantities of feed, the objective of our study was to determine effects of including a programmed gain phase in the finishing period on performance and carcass characteristics of yearling steers.

### Procedure

Two hundred forty-five crossbred yearling steers (868 lb) were blocked by weight into seven weight blocks and randomly assigned within block to one of five pens (7 head/pen). Each pen was randomly assigned to one of five treatments based on rate and duration of programmed gain. Control (Ad Lib) steers were allowed ad libitum access to feed for the entire finishing period. Programmed gain treatments were as follows: 2.4 lb/day for 21 days (2.4/21); 2.4 lb/day for 42 days (2.4/42); 2.8 lb/day for 21 days (2.8/21); 2.8 lb/day for 42 days (2.8/42). Following the programmed gain phase (either 21 or 42 days), steers were allowed to consume feed ad libitum. Intake required to achieve the programmed rate of gain was calculated using the net energy equations contained in the NRC (1996) computer model and were adjusted every 7 days.

Adaptation diets contained 57, 44, 32 and 18% corn silage (DM basis). The final diet (Table 1) was formulated to contain a minimum of 13.5% CP, .70% Ca, .35% P and .65% K, and contained 25g/ton Rumensin and 10 g/ton Tylan (DM basis). Steers were implanted with Revalor-S® at the beginning of the trial. Steers were slaughtered when the ad libitum control group was visually estimated to have reached .45 inches of fat over the 12th rib. Following a 24-hour chill, USDA yield grade, marbling score, and 12th rib fat thickness were recorded. Final weights were calculated by adjusting hot carcass weights to a common

dressing percentage (63%). In an effort to adjust for gut fill differences, weights of steers consuming feed ad libitum were shrunk 4% to be used in programmed gain period performance calculations.

### Results

Cumulative performance and performance during the programmed gain period is shown in Table 2. During the programmed gain period, feeding steers ad libitum resulted in higher ( $P < .10$ ) feed consumption compared with steers in treatments that included a programmed gain phase. Daily gain was reduced ( $P < .10$ ) in steers programmed to gain 2.4 or 2.8 lb/day for 21 days compared with steers fed ad libitum or steers programmed to gain 2.4 or 2.8 lb/day for 42 days. Steers fed to gain 2.4 or 2.8 lb/day for 42 days gained more rapidly than predicted while steers programmed to gain 2.4 or 2.8 lb/day for 21 days gained at or near predicted levels. The underprediction of gain is consistent with previous research in that as duration of the programmed gain period increases relative to the entire feeding period, daily gain exceeds predictions. Feed conversion was improved ( $P < .10$ ) in steers programmed to gain 2.4 or 2.8 lb/day for 42 days compared with steers fed ad libitum or steers programmed to gain 2.4 or 2.8 lb/day for 21 days. Feed conversion was numerically increased in steers

programmed to gain 2.4 lb/day for 21 days and increased ( $P < .10$ ) significantly in steers programmed to gain 2.8 lb/day for 21 days compared with steers offered feed ad libitum.

Over the entire feeding period, feed consumption was higher ( $P < .10$ ) in steers allowed to consume feed ad libitum throughout the feeding period. Steers programmed to gain 2.4 or 2.8 lb/d for the initial 21 days of the feeding period had similar cumulative DMI and both consumed more feed ( $P < .10$ ) than steers programmed to gain 2.4 or 2.8 lb/day for the first 42 days. Steers programmed to gain 2.4 lb/day for the initial 42 days of the feeding period consumed less feed ( $P < .10$ ) than all of the other treatments. Slight numerical differences in daily gain existed among the treatments; however, only steers programmed to gain 2.4 lb/day for the initial 42 days of the feeding period gained slower ( $P < .10$ ) than steers offered feed ad libitum. There were no differences observed in feed conversion among the treatments. Differences in total feed consumed (lb/head) were reflective of the differences in DMI.

Currently, our hypothesis as to why we have been unable to detect a significant efficiency response in this and a previous trial (1999 Nebraska Beef Report, pp 46-48) is related to the nature of our finishing diets. In both of our programmed gain trials, wet corn gluten feed has been included in the diet at

**Table 2. Effect of programmed gain on performance of yearling steers.**

	Treatment					
Item	Ad Lib	2.4/21	2.4/42	2.8/21	2.8/42	SEM
Treatment Description						
ADG, lb	Maximum	2.4	2.4	2.8	2.8	
Duration, days	98	21	42	21	42	
Days on feed	98	98	98	98	98	
Pens	7	7	7	7	7	
Initial Wt., lb	868 <sup>a</sup>	870 <sup>a</sup>	863 <sup>b</sup>	868 <sup>a</sup>	871 <sup>a</sup>	2
Final Wt., lb	1265 <sup>a</sup>	1253 <sup>a</sup>	1223 <sup>b</sup>	1245 <sup>a</sup>	1253 <sup>a</sup>	9
Programmed Gain Period <sup>c</sup>						
DMI, lb/day	23.63 <sup>d</sup>	17.97 <sup>e</sup>	17.94 <sup>e</sup>	19.55 <sup>f</sup>	19.78 <sup>f</sup>	.18
ADG, lb	3.34 <sup>de</sup>	2.33 <sup>f</sup>	3.16 <sup>e</sup>	2.44 <sup>f</sup>	3.69 <sup>d</sup>	.16
Feed/Gain	7.2 <sup>d</sup>	8.1 <sup>de</sup>	5.7 <sup>f</sup>	8.6 <sup>e</sup>	5.4 <sup>f</sup>	.5
Cumulative Performance						
DMI, lb/day	25.17 <sup>d</sup>	24.39 <sup>e</sup>	22.22 <sup>f</sup>	24.48 <sup>e</sup>	23.50 <sup>g</sup>	.28
ADG, lb	4.05 <sup>d</sup>	3.92 <sup>d</sup>	3.67 <sup>e</sup>	3.85 <sup>d</sup>	3.90 <sup>d</sup>	.08
Feed/Gain	6.2	6.2	6.1	6.4	6.1	.1
Total feed, lb/head	2467 <sup>d</sup>	2390 <sup>e</sup>	2178 <sup>f</sup>	2399 <sup>e</sup>	2303 <sup>g</sup>	27

<sup>ab</sup>Means within a row with unlike superscripts differ ( $P < .10$ ).

<sup>c</sup>Days 1-21 for Treatments 2 and 4; Days 1-42 for Treatments 1, 3, and 5.

<sup>defg</sup>Means within a row with unlike superscripts differ ( $P < .10$ ).

**Table 3. Effect of programmed gain on carcass characteristics of yearling steers.**

Item	Treatment					SEM
	Ad Lib	2.4/21	2.4/42	2.8/21	2.8/42	
Hot carcass weight, lb	785 <sup>a</sup>	777 <sup>a</sup>	758 <sup>b</sup>	772 <sup>ab</sup>	777 <sup>a</sup>	5
Marbling score <sup>c</sup>	530	529	517	533	531	14
Yield grade	2.47 <sup>d</sup>	2.34 <sup>de</sup>	2.03 <sup>f</sup>	2.24 <sup>ef</sup>	2.47 <sup>d</sup>	.13
Fat thickness, in	.50 <sup>d</sup>	.47 <sup>d</sup>	.40 <sup>e</sup>	.47 <sup>d</sup>	.47 <sup>d</sup>	.02
Net profit, \$ <sup>gh</sup>	(.74)	(4.32)	(8.51)	(8.53)	(1.37)	5.07

<sup>ab</sup>Means within a row with unlike superscripts differ ( $P < .10$ ).

<sup>c</sup>Marbling score: Small 0 = 500.

<sup>def</sup>Means within a row with unlike superscripts differ ( $P < .10$ ).

<sup>g</sup>Values used in calculations: purchase price = \$75.00/cwt; sales price = \$65.00/cwt; yardage = \$.30/d; feed cost = \$100.00/ton; feed and cattle interest = 10%.

<sup>h</sup>Values in parentheses indicate losses.

relatively high levels (35-40% of DM). In previous studies reporting an efficiency response with programmed gain systems, the finishing diets did not contain byproduct feedstuffs. It has been shown that wet corn gluten feed inclusion in finishing diets helps to alleviate sub-acute acidosis. Part of the efficiency response that has been observed in previous studies could be related to a reduced level of acidosis that would likely accompany the limited amounts of feed offered to programmed gain treatment groups. Consequently, the number and

severity of acidosis challenges during the feeding period could be reduced.

Carcass characteristics are shown in Table 3. Hot carcass weights were reduced ( $P < .10$ ) in steers programmed to gain 2.4 lb/day for the initial 42 days of the feeding period compared with steers offered feed ad libitum, steers programmed to gain 2.4 lb/day for 21 days, or steers programmed to gain 2.8 lb/d for 42 days. There were no differences among the treatments in marbling score. Yield grade was lower ( $P < .10$ ) in steers programmed to gain 2.4 lb/day for 42

days than in steers offered feed ad libitum, steers programmed to gain 2.4 lb/day for 21 days, or steers programmed to gain 2.8 lb/d for 42 days. Steers programmed to gain 2.4 lb/day for 42 days had less ( $P < .10$ ) fat over the 12th rib compared with all other treatments. Though there were no significant differences in calculated net profit values, they are reflective of slight differences in hot carcass weight among the treatments. Offering feed ad libitum was calculated to be the most profitable of the feeding systems in this trial. However, in times of high feed costs, differences in the amount of feed consumed per animal may allow producers to effectively and economically utilize programmed gain feeding systems.

<sup>1</sup>Tony Scott, research technician, Animal Science, Lincoln; Todd Milton, assistant professor, Animal Science, Lincoln; Terry Klopfenstein, professor, Animal Science, Lincoln; Terry Mader, professor, Animal Science, Concord; Simone Holt, graduate student, Animal Production, University of Queensland-Gatton, Gatton, Queensland, Australia.

## Sorting or Topping-off Pens of Feedlot Cattle

**Rob Cooper**  
**Terry Klopfenstein**  
**Todd Milton<sup>1</sup>**

Sorting or topping-off finished cattle within a pen may increase overall pen profitability. Leaner cattle within a pen at slaughter are not necessarily poor performers.

### Summary

Two sources of data were analyzed to determine performance differences of cattle with differing degrees of finish within a pen. One source of data was from large-pen commercial feedlots, while the other source of data was from individually fed steers at the University

of Nebraska. The results indicate leaner cattle within a pen have lower quality grades and carcass weights, but are gaining faster and more efficiently than their fatter pen-mates at slaughter. Therefore, additional days on feed for the leaner cattle within a pen, in order to increase carcass weight and quality grade, may be economical.

### Introduction

In most commercial feedlot situations, large variations exist in animal weight and finish within a pen. A previous marketing project conducted by the University of Nebraska in large-pen commercial feedlots (1999 Nebraska Beef Report, pp. 57-59) found an average of 540 lb variation in final weight and .89 inch variation in 12th rib fat depth within a

pen at slaughter. If cattle are sold using a value-based marketing system, sorting or topping-off of cattle in a pen at market time may be beneficial. Sorting off the fatter cattle and marketing them early should help reduce yield grade 4 discounts. Additional time on feed for the remaining cattle in the pen should increase the percentage of carcasses grading USDA Choice and the overall pounds of carcass sold from the pen. Ideally, more pounds of higher grading carcasses would be sold from the pen, resulting in increased profitability.

There are two primary concerns with a system of topping-off pens of finished cattle. The first is the reduced number of cattle occupying a pen after the initial sort. The reduced yardage and efficiency of pen space needs to be weighed against

(Continued on next page)