Weaver Feeding & Management, LLC 22770 Truman Road Darlington, WI 53530

The entire green movement can't stand on its own two feet and the only time anything green ever gets money is when it comes from government." - Glenn Beck (a courageous patriot!)

## KOW Ruminations

## Learn more at www.kowconsulting.com

Fully independent soil consulting-agronomy-nutrition. We do dairy nutrition from the soil up. Produced by WF&M for KOW Consulting Assoc. Ph 608-762-6948, fx 6949, kowboy@kowconsulting.com June-July 2010

Coolidge

What will the environmental progressive agency do now?

Before you who own and use bunkers, pits, and piles to store your silage toss this newsletter in the bedding heap, stay with me for a little laugh -and maybe even some useful info / instruction. My title comes from an article I read in May 10, 2010, Feedstuffs titled "Science sheds light on emissions" by Cliff Gauldin. This KOWboy nearly "fell off his horse" with laughter over the news. 

To summarize, dairy farms in the San Joaquin Valley of California have been *required* (mandated by regulation) to install **manure digester systems** in order to capture methane and other "green house" gases. This since a law was passed in 2004. They (watermelon enviromentalist's, green on the outside but red on the inside) were blaming them girls for causin' high ozone levels -too much burpin' and gas from the other end. Those *manure* storage ponds were *the* cause of the terrible haze. It was all based upon some little bit of science from 1938 and the powers that be made 'em install the digester systems -of which many are already shut down 'cause they already came up with new / additional regulations that make the digesters too expensive to run! Well, in the meantime, a little more up-to-date research was conducted and they found

out the amount of "emissions" coming off the manure holding ponds was "almost undetectable" 

. Yep! This is collective government action at its best. No supportive science, no supportive economic system -and boatloads of money down the literal poop-hole ③. If ya wanna learn more, contact Cliff Gauldin directly at CMA Consulting, LLC (ph 816-556-3124, cliff@cmakc.com).

This country believes in prosperity. It is absurd to

suppose that it is envious of those who are already prosperous. The wise and correct course to follow in taxation and all other economic legislation is not to destroy those who have already secured success

but to create conditions under which every one will have a better chance to be successful." -Calvin

Isn't it time to ridicule? Of course, this is all about the "greenhouse gas" / "climate change" level of scientific credibility, so no matter how much non-sense and corruption gets exposed, there will always be those committed to keeping the **lie** alive because of the *money* and power involved. Yours truly has written plenty about this in past newsletters, so please be tolerant if I go on and on. It's for love of country and farm families. There's still some big money that have a progressive / socialist dream (nightmare?) of few very large (multithousand cow) dairies *replacing* small business dairy – with *direct financial support* via the carbon tax payments (cap and trade) going into manure digester / methane capture systems. These will be completely government controlled (after all, what CAFO isn't?), but owned by

international corporations –by **definition** fascist enterprises. Why? Because food control is such a very powerful tool. Contemplate that a moment. Has this KOWboy ever done anything but "shoot straight" with

ya? It's okay to think I'm nutz, but please... the evidence of the scheme is so very out in the open now. Here in Wisconsin, we just had a big "voluntary" Ag Star conference in Green Bay (4/27-28/10) which focused on promoting more manure digester systems. Don't get me

wrong, all well if the free market / private investors fund the projects. Unfortunately, this was sponsored by the EPA (Environmental *Progressive* Agency? Regulations creeping toward tyranny?), the USDA (Unrelenting Socialist Destruction of Ag?) and the US Dept. of Energy (ever notice they don't produce any?). Conference speakers spoke of the dairy industry being "transformed." One of the key speakers was a real "progressive" feller by the name of Shonodeep Modak, who just happens to be "in charge of global marketing for General Electric Energy." He told the crowd how Germany and China were "ahead" of the US. "Government economic incentives are part of the reason behind the many digesters in those countries," "It's really all about money." Mr. Modak was quoted as saying (source, Agri-View 5-13-10, pg C-6 "Plenty of potential for biogas systems on US farms" by Ron Johnson). Well, that about sums it up and this should give everyone gas . because it's much bigger than "sustainable energy" -cause it ain't sustained without giving up a lot of money and control over both the energy and food systems (-specifically dairy in this case, but it's not limited to dairy alone). If you recall what I've written in newsletters past, this has potential to significantly increase the cost of energy for all small businesses (including dairy), while favoring the very large international (global) corporate businesses (mega dairy business centers?) with *energy tax money*. I inform you of this stuff so you can prepare for higher **energy costs** (*graze*, etc.). It is now being exposed by at least one courageous news commentator (go to www.glennbeck.com and look at "Crime, Inc."). This is about a **global** network of *anti-American independence* and prosperity activity and is tied into the Chicago Climate Exchange, the proposed cap and trade / tax (or possibly a name change to the "American Power Act"), current and past Presidential administrations, various tax exempt (money laundering?) foundations that even lead back to America's Dairyland at the University of Wisconsin, Madison and a man by the name of Joel Rogers (who Beck has called the "great Oz

behind the curtain" promoting much that is happening).

program, Mr. Rogers's neighborhood. Rogers is director

of COWS (www.cows.org) which ain't got anything to do

with KOW, but maybe something to do with milkin' 'em

with union labor . This is all the equivalent of the

The future of all this ain't quite like the old children's

Tower of Babel, so pray it comes to the same end -but I digress.

Well, the researchers did figure out what part of the

The demand for milk products in the

800 farms milking 10,000 cows each.

manager of Dairy Planning, 3-25-10,

United States could be supplied by

-Steve Watrin, Land O'Lakes,

Hoard's Dairyman.

dairy farms was givin' them hazy skies in California. Them darn silage bunkers / piles ③. Yep! Please forgive as I gloat over how this simple little report in *Feedstuffs* confirms and supports what this KOWboy has been writing on both the manure digesters and the silage

storage problems. The economic viability of both manure digesters and *improper* silage storage is in question here. How does silage cause air pollution? Well, the University of Ca-Davis researchers think that there's so much silage rotting in the S. J. Valley that it's blowing off too much carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and, possibly, methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). (Maybe these are foogin' up the valley at times, but they ain't burnin' up the globe. 

Maybe a "team of experts" should first go to Iceland to fix that emissions problem . . . wonder how *volcanic* emissions compare to silage?) They propose a solution: switch to **bagging** silage and it'll cut "emissions" by 90% . Well, I suppose the silage bagging salesmen like this answer ©. Regulations could make sales easier. (That's what many international corporate fascists are hoping for @ government mandates requiring purchase of their stuff all in the name of saving the planet.) Why would scientists conclude a switch to bagging would solve the "problem"? Why didn't they merely recommend a new inoculant? Was it because the silo-bagger companies contributed research money while the inoculant industry did not? Now-a-days one must question scientific integrity due to the sway of big money and political agendas -it's reasonable to ask ("global warming" is a fine example of science corrupted by money and political agenda -isn't it?). However, I think it may also be reasonable to consider some well established science involved in the bio-chemistry of silage making.

The *goal* of silage making is *preservation* –is it not? From the moment forage is cut, there's a race with time and aerobic (live with oxygen) microbes that begin to digest the crop. That gas blowin' off is a by-product of digestion. The dairyman, of course, is interested in having anaerobic (live without oxygen) rumen microorganisms do the digestion "job" -so the energy and nutrients released can be used for productive (possibly even profitable!) purposes. Both pathways of digestion are entirely natural. It's a very "green thing" either way and farmers should point out to them city folks that no matter how the energy / nutrients get recycled, it is in the farmers' best financial interest to make sure the maximum amount (that is economically feasible) finds its way through a cow and back to the crop fields (education is the answer, not more regulation). However, whenever organic matter breaks down in nature -whether it be in a wet lands preserve or

swamp or from a <u>natural</u> storage sink such as coal and oil—it converts that energy to  $CO_2$  and  $H_2O$ . Just in case you need a bio-chemistry refresher, plants really *thrive* on this stuff  $\odot$ . (Most *farmers* know this, but <u>uneducated morons believe</u> these naturally occurring "chemicals" are causing the planet to "have a fever."

Actually, it's the opposite. Farmers observe and know that the warmer the weather, the faster plants grow –using up more CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O.) Unfortunately, too few dairy farmers know what happens in the silo –or what's suppose to happen – the biological process is hidden from view. In spite of sales "propaganda", given the right combination

"... Finally, we come to **storing our forages the right way**. If you look at it, there are 20 different ways to make a silage pit –and countless other theories.

"Traditionally, we have made a **standard push-up pit atop a concrete slab**. This has worked well **except for what we have to pitch off**. This year we're going to try a rollover pile to minimize the amount of **spoil** on top. We hope to see a great improvement on top of our pits." –Brian Medeiros, 2300 cows, San Jorquin Valley, Ca, *Dairy Today*, May 2010. (Emphasis added.)

of ingredients / conditions, good (well preserved) silage can be achieved without special additives.

The first and highest priority is to eliminate oxygen as soon as possible. It doesn't matter how you do this, only that it gets done fast / well. Oxygen cannot be tolerated in silage making -period. Lactic acid fermentation is exclusively an anaerobic process. The reason the California researchers are suggesting the dairymen switch to silo bags is because they know the aerobic microbes must be choked off -dead. They have to quickly end / stop the aerobic digestion process and establish a stable, low pH (lactic acid dominated) condition in order to eliminate the end products of that continued, more extensive diaestion. Sealed plastic all around the silage mass significantly increases the probability of this goal being achieved. However, silobagging equipment, although a very successful system. is not needed to eliminate oxygen. What is needed is compression and/or moisture to displace air (oxygen) and plastic or any type of oxygen blocking barrier to keep it out. The drier the crop, the more compression needed. This should help us to understand why top unloading tower silos rarely ever have / make the best silage on the top and why well managed (compressed) balage preserves so well. The same quality of preservation / fermentation could be made if chopped or well compressed bales were buried under *heavily weighted*, *sealed* plastic. Since chopped forage springs back and is somewhat "juiced" as it is driven over with a packing tractor, it is a greater challenge. Nevertheless, if the I-o-n-g time recommended KOW protocol of sidewall covering and triple-top-sheeting is used with 6 to 8 inches of limestone over the top of bunkers, the probability of success goes up significantly. I've become an advocate for the porous mesh polyethelene cover material known commercially as **Secure Cover**<sup>TM</sup> (<u>www.securecovers.com</u> or www.afsbagman.com)-in fact have signed up for dealership (order through me and KOW clients will get a rebate). This reusable material protects the plastic

sheeting **while holding it down** *tightly* in place. While the marketers advocate using **only** gravel filled bags to hold it down, I'm of the considered opinion that, especially <u>if</u> my bunker **balage** or drive over *balage* system is tried, it should be <u>covered</u> with at least 6 to 8 inches of gravel or crushed limestone. *Gravel* over this

material may require extra effort for removal, but should be relatively easy to brush off from <u>bales</u> before feeding — and lower in cost. See the sketches and explanations of the KOW bunker and balage covering methods on the website or ask me for a copy. It's all about compression and seal. Silage preservation has never been or ever needed to be high-tech in

terms of equipment. I offer the alternative ideas for economic reasons. The cost of equipment and fuel may crush us in the small business dairy someday soon—if you don't agree it has already (the basis for my promotion of grazing). A powerful loader machine can do a lot of work on the farm, including burying bales [or chopped silage] under rocks, limestone or sand. While geologists claim these latter things eventually wear out, they don't seem to depreciate as fast or require the repair and maintenance costs of the shiny painted tools. 

Some folks pack and seal bunkers / pits / piles as if they don't know how to fix a tire. While we know that "one little hole" still ends up in a flat, the thinking gets discarded when sealing the silo. Why?

The 2<sup>nd</sup> priority is simply providing sugar for lactic acid producing microbes to "eat." This need not be added (but may be -see guidelines on the KOW website or ask for them). The *most important* part about providing sugar is to make it in the field and not lose it by leaving the forage lying there after it's been cut. The hay-in-a-day teaching using wide swath management is some of the most useful information we've gotten from our forage researcher's in many years (I give credit to Tom Kilcer of Cornell University Extension for his work http://counties.cce.cornell.edu/rensselaer/agriculture). Lay it out wide (85% of standing width) so it can both dry rapidly and continue to photosynthesize sugars at the same time. This helps to *concentrate* sugar. No stem crushing needed for silage / balage making -only the simplest sickle bar or disk-type mower is required. (I'd recommend we revive use of the ol' simple sickle bar mowers, or buy a simple disk type like a Reese. www.reeseagri.com or tigercoinc.com. Ph 800-432-4020, fx 660-645-2214.) The warmer the night temperature, the sooner you must get it off the field. Sometimes it's best to cut it in the morning and harvest it late in the day. A hot, windy day usually allows this target moisture being 65% (35% DM). If you leave your crop" in the refrigerator" overnight (cool night temps), little will be lost because microbial digestion and

respiration of *plant sugars* will be greatly *slowed*. This is why it's easier to retain the green color of forages harvested very late in the season. However, if you leave it lie on a hot summer night, those aerobic microbes are rapidly feasting on and belching them planet destroying (⊚?!) gases all night long. For the sake of us all ⊚. don't do that! That forage turns brown for the same reason anything that gets digested by anything turns **brown**. No wonder we sometimes complain that the forage turns to \*?!!\* before it's time (before it goes through a cow)! Those sugars are really essential to feed lactic acid producing microbes in the silo. If sugar is lost in the field, often, the butyric acid producers take over in the silo. These clostridial organisms are always present (especially in soil) but do not grow well in lactic acid -low pH. We often end up with *butyric* silage when it is rained on or put in too wet or if leached / "juiced" in / through -in the silo. This is primarily due to loss / lack (dilution) of sugar to feed the lactic acid producers —which also are always present (usually in sufficient numbers to promote a successful silage fermentation, if we create the other necessary conditions). By the way, if the cow directly harvests (grazes) the forage, those **sugars** *directly* promote microbial growth in the rumen -a significant enhancement to feed efficiency -that we'll consider later . . .

This brings us to **priority #3**: having sufficient numbers of lactobacillus plantarum organisms. While much is made of the "need" for commercial inoculants, this KOWboy maintains that the naturally occurring strains are sufficient if priorities 1 and 2 are done well. Historically, researchers have recognized and agreed with this, but the lure of economic benefits to ag sales and research has caused a change in perspective and emphasis. This is why the "holy grail" of silage making today is you "must" seek out for and inoculate with "research proven" brand X inoculant. This in spite of the fact that farmers can rarely see / measure any economic benefits to it! (If you disagree, please show me your onfarm *measured* data –not inoculant sales literature!) Don't get me wrong. I'm not totally opposed to adding a few "bugs." A frosted or rained on crop may benefit. Some of the new **buchneri** strains, although less efficient in energy preservation, may be helpful to improve silo face / bunk "life" in high moisture shelled corn. I simply tell you: claims are exaggerated in order to get you to part with your money. 

Do you want to improve inoculation without buying something? Here's a significant thing. Stop mixing soil into the forage. As noted previously, it's a great source for clostridial / butyric producing "bugs" (ideal for compost piles, not silage (a). If you're running the diskbine and/or rake too low, you're inoculating with "butyricneri" @ . . . Hey, that gives me a great marketing idea. Maybe the KOWboyz could sack up some special dirt . . .

Much is made of *feed efficiency* now-a-days. *Grazing* whenever the weather is cooperative and making the

best silage possible is a *significant* part of improving the feed-in: milk-out ratio. (*Experts* report a range of 1.1 to 1.9 –with an *average* of 1 ½ lbs of milk produced for each lb of dry matter intake.) The next most important thing that can be done is to *only milk fresh cows* ③... well, as many as you can. This means you need a good breeding / *reproduction* program-which requires quality forage and healthy cows with good feet and legs –which requires high forage rations –which require high quality forage ③. 'Round-n-'round we go! Crazy as it might seem, there's a lot of emphasis on ration *additives* to boost that feed efficiency number lately. Gee, I wonder why?

Gettin' to be a *long* list of stuff that's purported to "squeeze" more milk outa the same ration. Various enzymes and microbials and yeast products, which have been around many years, are making bolder claims about how they enhance digestion. Some claim adding amvlase enzyme will enable the dairyman to feed less corn with similar results. My answer to that is that the KOWboyz have been doin' that without the additive for years by taking advantage of higher quality forage ③. The big factors for corn digestion are hybrid selection, moisture and particle size. If you pick a softer, amylopectin -type kernel, store it as high moisture and grind it, you'll be able to measure the benefits. Some additive marketers claim their "stuff" significantly improves / alters rumen pH, to the extent that you can feed much higher levels of corn without suffering the consequences of rumen acidosis. While Na-bicarb or other buffers have **proven** some *limited* benefits in this regard, I'd recommend skepticism with the thimble full of wonder dust @ -although I'll sure agree that rumen acidosis has a significant negative affect on feed efficiency. Cows with acidosis exhibit *indigestion*. If the "wonder dust" is being fed and you can see undigested feed passing in the manure -it ain't helpin' much on that feed efficiency number ③. Companies are also puttin' money into research on "essential oils" for enhancing feed efficiency. These are really extracts of stuff in your wife's cupboard: thyme, oregano, clove, dill, cinnamon, hot peppers, garlic, tea tree oil, etc. While I know some of these have antifungal / microbial and nutritional benefits, the potential payback is slim. You've maybe seen this KOWboy recommend garlic and oregano leaf in calf starter (antimicrobial / coccidial), cinnamon is a great source of chromium (maybe feed some to fresh cows?). Hard to make a "push" for stuff like this in these economic times. Even the companies promoting additives know they need a compelling argument to get farms to use these products. The folks sellin' *monensin* (Rumensin<sup>™</sup>) have the "leg up" on 'em all 'cause it reduces methane belching into the environment, and beside enhancing feed efficiency, it can save us all from certain destruction -"climate change." 

Somebody really should be lookin' into how it could be required by the EPA . . . Actually, I think some, many, of these "global" companies are already thinking' about the potential.