

GENETICS AND MANAGEMENT OF LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION TO MEET WORLD FOOD DEMAND FOR 2025



Michael Dikeman



Matt Spangler



Mike Tokach



Andrzej Sosnicki

See handout for Speaker Bios

PRIMARY PURPOSE OF PRODUCING CATTLE

- ✘ To convert grass, forages, and various by-products, plus some human-edible protein and energy, into high protein, highly nutritious, tasty beef.
 - Beef should be safe, affordable, attractive, nutritious, and highly palatable
 - Carcasses should yield a high percentage of meat
 - Both cattle production and beef processing must be profitable, sustainable, and socially responsible

2011 DROUGHT EFFECTS

- Severe drought and heat of 2011 → long lasting effects on beef cattle production
- A dramatic reduction in cow numbers & only modest retention of heifers has resulted in decreased breeding herd numbers to 1950's level
- And, the drought might not be over! Grass has been significantly damaged.
 - Convert to “drought” stocking rates

FUTURE LAND AND FEED RESOURCES FOR CATTLE

According to Joyce Turk, Bureau of Food Security, US AID:

- To sustainably feed a growing population to 9 billion by 2050, resources of water, fossil fuel, and grain must be used more efficiently
- Global land area available for grazing livestock is close to its biological limit, putting pastoral systems under pressure

WORLD FOOD SUPPLY AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION

- Nearly 1 billion people are starving, malnourished, or 'food insecure'
- Livestock production is critical to food security & livelihood of world's population
 - Might be more important in the poorest countries.
- Livestock sector employs 1.3 billion people, either directly or indirectly, and responsible for up to 50% of global agriculture GDP. (Joyce Turk, U.S. AID)

DEMAND FOR HIGH QUALITY BEEF

- ✓ Demand for “high quality” beef increased during the current economic recession (Scott Brown, Univ. MO; John Stika, CAB)
- ✓ Brown: Potential for significant industry expansion **if** more herds produce “Premium Choice” or Prime beef.
 - ✓ **If** producers do not, recovery might be modest (< 2 million head increase in 5-6 years)
 - ✓ **If** they do, ≈ 4 million head increase in 5-6 years
- ✓ Could mean “a 10% increase in overall demand for beef” and long term expansion

GENETIC IMPROVEMENT OF MEAT YIELD AND QUALITY

- Too much emphasis is placed on attaining 'premium' marbling by feeding cattle to undesirable fatness levels
- Angus, Simmental, and some other breeds have EPDs for fatness, marbling, and ribeye area; the Simmental breed also has EPDs for WBSF
- These traits are moderately high in heritability!
- Selecting for these EPDs allows for management of the genetic antagonism between % meat yield and marbling



AI SIRES EXCELLING IN BOTH MUSCLING AND MEAT QUALITY

- ❖ Example of 2 Simmental sires in 2 major AI studs:
 - ❖ Sire #1 = top 1% Marbling, Ribeye, and WBSF
 - ❖ Sire #2 = top 1% Marbling, top 5% for Ribeye, and top 10% for WBSF
 - ❖ Both = above average Growth Rate; Top 2% for All Purpose and Terminal Indexes
- ❖ Based on traditional EPD calculations without DNA information incorporated

ANGUS SIRES EXCELLING IN BOTH MUSCLING AND MARBLING

- One AI sire has EPDs of +1.3 of a marbling score, +0.6 in² for ribeye, and -0.04 in. for fat thickness
- Another sire has EPDS of +0.8 for marbling, +0.7 for ribeye, and -0.04 in. for fat thickness
- However, the genetic range for fat thickness for about 99% of \approx 400 Angus sires in major AI studs is -.04 to +0.08 in. = only 0.30 of a yield grade difference
 - Breeders generally have not emphasized fat thickness

U.S. CONSUMER DEMAND FOR BEEF

- ✓ Record high prices for feeder cattle are great for cow-calf producers, but not feedlots and beef processors (Dr. Mike Sands, Informa Economics, Inc.)
- ✓ A significant proportion of feedlots are running at 62-75% capacity. Not sustainable!
 - ✓ In 2012, several weeks of \$100+ losses/head
- ✓ Possibly 1 or 2 beef processing plants could close
- ✓ Beef reached **record retail high \$5.09/lb** in January
 - ✓ With high unemployment and recession, consumers' budgets are strained
 - ✓ Consumers have/will shift away from beef

FUTURE OF BACK-GROUNDING GOOD CATTLE ON FORAGE?

- Some research shows that months of back-grounding before grain finishing can be somewhat negative toward marbling deposition
- Forage is extremely short in a significant portion of the US because of recent droughts
- An increase in cow numbers will require a significant portion of available grass and forage to be used by cows, not backgrounding

NCA “WAR ON FAT”

- In late 1970s, NCA emphasized the industry needs to “win the war on fat”
- > 30 years later, the industry is not winning
- Upper yield grade 3 carcasses have \approx 24% fat trim, depending on trim level
- “Premium Choice” programs allow yield grade 4 carcasses (\approx 28% fat trim)
- Too many cattle breeders and/or breeds have not been responsible for genetic improvement of meat yield **and** marbling

MEAT YIELD VALUE DIFFERENCES

- Feeding cattle to YG 3+ and YG 4 endpoints is not efficient
- Instrument grading can accurately predict % meat yield
- But, meat yield data typically not used for premiums and discounts
 - The industry continues to use the 'crude' yield grade system, with only 'token' premiums for YG 1s and 2s
 - Using an \$180/100 lb base price and 3.5% meat yield difference, here can be up to \$16/100 lb difference between a typical YG2 and YG3 carcass
 - For 850 lb. carcasses of the same quality grade → \$136 difference in total value.
- Premiums and discounts based on % **meat yield** differences would be a '**milestone**' for the industry

CATTLE BUYERS: “FEED 30 MORE DAYS”

- ✓ U.S. MARC Cycle IV data (Wheeler et al., 1997) from different biological types of ‘calf-fed’ steers used for illustration
- ✓ Feeding 30 more days (after 426 days of age) resulted in a net decrease of 2% retail product because of increased fat trim
- ✓ Resulted in an 8% increase in % Choice (62 to 70%) for all breeds combined
 - ✓ 6% for *Bos indicus* (48 to 54%) and 10% for Hereford, Angus, Shorthorn (76 to 86%).

ECONOMICS OF FEEDING 30 MORE DAYS?

- ✓ I assumed 100 cattle gained 100 lb. live weight that cost \$125 (10% higher than prior to 426 days)
- ✓ I assumed 75 lb carcass gain.
 - ✓ Cattle gained 37 lb. fat; 32 lb. meat
- ✓ I assumed 65% base meat yield and wt. of 850 lb
- ✓ Value of 32 lb. meat + choice white grease = \$104.
Minus \$125 cost of gain = **<\$21/head>**
 - ✓ for 100 cattle = **<\$2,100>**
- ✓ Using a generous \$10 spread, 8% more Choice = +\$85/carcass for 8 cattle = \$680
- ✓ **<\$2,100>** + \$680 = **<\$1,420>** for 100 cattle

ECONOMICS OF CHANGING GENETICS?

- ✓ What if the 100 cattle had genetics for equal % Choice AND increased meat yield and no extra fat?
- ✓ Using efficiency of energy utilization for lipid deposition of 0.75 and 0.20 for protein deposition results in ≈ 1.72 times more muscle deposition than fat deposition on the same amount of energy
 - ✓ $1.72 \times 37 \text{ lb.} = 63 \text{ lb.}$
 - ✓ 63 lb. of muscle replaced 37 lb. of fat
- ✓ = net increase in value of \$60.85/carcass, or **\$6,085** for the pen
- ✓ Producers need to be rewarded!

TECHNOLOGY IN BEEF PRODUCTION

- ❖ Implants are very cost effective for improving efficiency
 - ❖ They need to be used properly!
- ❖ Optaflexx™ is used rather widely to improve production efficiency and has no negative effect on meat quality when used as recommended
- ❖ Zilmax™ is more aggressive and distinctly improves production efficiency, but **must** be used properly to avoid negative effects on marbling and tenderness
- ❖ Technology + genetics!

ROLE OF NUTRITION ON MARBLING

- Three studies show some improvement in marbling by not supplementing finishing diets with vitamin A during last 120-150 days on feed

ROLE OF NUTRITION ON MARBLING DEVELOPMENT

- ✘ Clinton Krehbiel - Effects of Nutrition and Management During the Stocker Phase on Marbling
- ✘ Brad Johnson, and Stephen Smith - Role of Fatty Acids in Enhancing Marbling Development



TENDERNESS ASSURANCE

- USDA AMS developed:
 - “Standard Practice for Verifying Tenderness Marketing Claims Associated with Beef Cuts” (based on WBSF or SSF)
- Categories of:
 - “USDA Certified Tender”
 - “USDA Certified Very Tender”
- Should be very beneficial to the industry

NATIONAL BEEF TENDERNESS SURVEY 2010-11

- ✓ 10-point scale;
avg. \approx 6
- ✓ Is a score of 6
out of 10
encouraging?
- ✓ A score of 6
out of 10
would not earn
a faculty salary
increase or a
promotion!

Cut	Overall Like/Dislike	Tenderness Like/Dislike
Top blade	6.4	6.8
Ribeye , bnls	6.3	6.2
Ribeye, bone-in	5.9	6.1
Top Loin	6.1	6.2
T-bone	5.9	5.8
Top Sirloin, bnls	5.7	5.6

NATIONAL BEEF TENDERNESS SURVEY (2010-2011)

- ✘ 36% of beef was aged less than 14 days
(double from 2005-06)
- ✘ The industry should “sell no beef before its
time”!

Beef
Flavor



BEEF FLAVOR

- Beef often is the “celebration” meat because of its excellent flavor
- Highly marbled beef was recently described as having a “buttery” flavor (great for me!)
- 2012 NCBA winner of National Food Service Beef Backer Award serves ‘premium Choice’ beef, but does not serve butter!
 - Retail sales of butter \approx $\frac{1}{2}$ of margarine sales
- What flavor descriptors best promote the excellent flavor of beef?

'LEAN' BEEF IN A HEALTHY DIET

- ✓ There is somewhat of a conflict between producing high marbling through long feeding versus 'lean beef' in a healthy diet.
- ✓ Does this further emphasize the need for a "Retail target" that is guaranteed tender, AND a "White table cloth" target for \geq "premium Choice"?
- ✓ Retail sales of beef is by far the largest

SUMMARY

- For sustainability, beef production must be economically efficient, be 'socially responsible', and provide a high quality product
- Use of by-products and proper use of technology will be essential
- Reduction of waste fat must happen
- Sufficient marbling and 'guaranteed tenderness' will be vital
- There is great opportunity for beef production and processing in the future!!

CONCLUSIONS

- ✓ Great opportunity to increase meat production, mostly because of increased population
- ✓ Cow herd expansion will require additional grass, forages, and by-products = less used for back-grounding feeder cattle (?)
- ✓ Genetics, nutrition, and technology must 'compliment' each other
- ✓ Tremendous opportunity for cattle expansion **IF** the industry uses genetics, nutrition, and technology '**Optimally**'

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!