In many domestic species photoperiod manipulation is used to enhance growth and increase production. In poultry exposure to extended periods of light (long day photoperiod; LDPP) is commonly implemented to increase egg production, while in horses LDPP is used to manipulate reproduction. A dairy cow’s exposure to LDPP has been shown to increase milk production an average of 5.1 lbs./day, which is of great interest to some dairy producers. The response to LDPP also appears to be fixed across various production levels and can be combined with other management strategies that improve milk production, such as bST or frequent milking. As a result manipulating photoperiod in dairy cows is a useful tool to improve milk production efficiency.

Manipulating photoperiod has not been widely adopted in the dairy industry, most likely because the increase in milk production is hard to quantify on commercial dairy farms. Others have suggested that the increase in milk production associated with LDPP is limited to increasing dry matter intake. However, the increase in dry matter intake lags behind the milk yield response to LDPP. Indicating that the demand for energy to support the added milk production stimulates dry matter intake. Moreover, one of the most consistent responses to LDPP has been an increase in circulating concentrations of prolactin and insulin-like growth factor I, both of which are associated with improved mammary growth and function.

More recent research has shown that exposing cows to short day photoperiod (SDPP) during the dry period increases milk yield during the subsequent lactation. Dry cows exposed to SDPP express higher levels of prolactin-receptor mRNA, suggesting that exposing cows to LDPP during lactation and SDPP during the dry period would increase levels of prolactin and its corresponding receptor. This provides additional evidence that prolactin is responsive to photoperiod manipulation; stimulating mammary growth and immune function, both of which are likely contribute to increasing milk yield.

Continue on page 3
Mission Statement
The NWNY Dairy, Livestock & Field Crops team will provide lifelong education to the people of the agricultural community to assist them in achieving their goals. Through education programs & opportunities, the NWNY Team seeks to build producers’ capacities to:

♦ Enhance the profitability of their business
♦ Practice environmental stewardship
♦ Enhance employee & family well-being in a safe work environment
♦ Provide safe, healthful agricultural products
♦ Provide leadership for enhancing relationships between agricultural sector, neighbors & the general public.
To produce the response, lights should be strategically placed to provide all areas of the barn with a minimum light intensity of 150 to 200 lux, not just the feed bunk. Lactating cows exposed to LDPP require 16 to 18 hours of light, followed by a continuous 6 to 8 hour period of darkness. In lactating cows, continuous light exposure should be avoided to maximize the milk production response. Conversely, dry cows should be limited to 8 hours/day of light exposure. For the remaining 16 hours/day dry cows should be kept in darkness to maximize the milk yield response. This can be maintained using enclosed, well-ventilated barns. In addition, during periods of darkness low intensity red lighting from 7 to 15-W incandescent bulbs can be used for observing both lactating and dry cows, as this range of the light spectrum is not perceived as light by cows.

Now may be an opportune time to implement photoperiod manipulation in the dairy industry as advances in lighting technology, such as the LED light bulb, are capable of providing effective and reliable lighting while reducing energy consumption. Similarly, the life expectancy of LED lighting is superior to other forms of lighting, providing a long-term return on investment. Ultimately, updating facilities to manipulate photoperiod can increase milk production while reducing energy costs and after installation requires minimal effort to maintain.

Jackson Wright is the Dairy Specialist with the North West New York Dairy, Livestock & Field Crops Team. For more information call 585.746.3016 or email: jbw243@cornell.edu
Fall Crop Topics and Tidbits

by: Mike Stanyard

2011 NY Corn and Soybean Yield Estimates
Based on conditions as of September 1, New York grain corn production is now expected to total 80.4 million bushels, down 9 percent from the 88.5 million bushels produced in 2010, according to King Whetstone, Director of the New York Field Office of the USDA’s National Agricultural Statistics Service. Acreage for grain harvest is estimated at 600,000 acres, up 2 percent from last year. Yields are expected to average 134 bushels per acre, down 16 bushels from 2010.

Soybean production in the Empire State is forecast at 11.6 million bushels, down 14 percent from the 13.4 million bushels produced in 2010. Acreage for harvest is a record high 282,000 acres up 1 percent from last year. Yields are expected to average 41 bushels per acre, 7 bushels below last year.

Stalk Rots in Corn
Stalk rot inoculum is usually present for most of the season but cannot infect healthy plants. However, accumulated stresses and plant maturation weakens the plant and allows the fungi to invade and spread. The drought stress that we experienced in late summer was all that we would have needed to bring on an infection. During this dry period, photosynthesis was reduced and plants were using all available carbohydrates for grain fill. The inability to replace these carbohydrates in the roots and stalks severely weakens the plants and allows them to be more susceptible. If stalk rot infested fields are located, these fields should be harvested early. Infected plants will mature quicker. Harvest early prior to lodging and ear drop to maximize yields!

Soybean Aphids
We escaped the every-other-year curse of the soybean aphid in 2011. Local SBA did not seem to successfully overwinter in high numbers. The early winged aphids I found did not survive and met their unfortunate end on cruiser treated beans! I am still finding some SBA out there throughout the whole plant. We still need to remain diligent as many of these could fly off and successfully overwinter on buckthorn. I still think insecticide seed treatments are a good management tool for early SBA in 2012.

Fall Weed Control in Wheat
A lot of wheat is being planted in WNY right now. If time and weather permit, the fall is a great time to go after problem weeds that germinate along with the winter wheat crop. This complex includes corn chamomile, shepherd’s purse, chickweed, henbit, and purple dead nettle. Buctril should be applied when rosettes are at least 1 inch across. Harmony Extra is effective on a broader spectrum of weeds (wild garlic & chamomile). It pays to scout your wheat fields and determine the weed species present in your fields. If you plan on frost seeding clover, now is your only chance for weed control. Decreasing high weed populations in the fall helps your wheat crop get off to a better start next spring!

Alfalfa Stand Assessment
It is time to determine if older alfalfa fields are going to be kept another year. Usually by the third year stands begin to look a little thin and weedy species such as dandelion and quackgrass can begin to take over. Herbicides can be applied to take out many of the broadleaf weeds but there might not be enough alfalfa plants to make it an economical choice. The best way to determine if your stand has enough yield potential is to count the number of alfalfa stems in a square foot. Take about five samples throughout the field and if the average number of stems per square foot is lower than 40, it is probably time to rotate.

The reduced forage yields this year may have some influence on whether or not to burn-down borderline fields. A better option might be to wait until next spring, take off first cutting, burn-down and plant back to corn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stems/sq. ft.</th>
<th>Yield Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Optimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-55</td>
<td>Some yield loss expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>Significant yield loss - rotate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Northeastern Silvopasture Conference
November 7 and 8, 2011
Harbor Hotel, Watkins Glen, NY

A two-day conference devoted to sustainable woodland grazing in the Northeastern US.

Learn how Silvopasturing can improve the health, performance and viability of livestock and forestry systems. Participants will include: Conservation Professionals and Foresters, Extension and University Faculty, Students, Graziers, Woodland Owners, Ag Support Agency Personnel, and Rural Community Development Advocates.

Registration begins 8 am, with conference beginning at 10 am.
Conference wraps up Tuesday afternoon with a farm tour to Angus Glen Farms, LLC, a silvopasturing farm.

The early registration rate is $89 which covers conference meals (breakfast, lunch and breaks). The normal rate of $129 will apply after October 23rd. Speakers are funded through the generosity of the conference partners. Space is limited, so please register early: http://nesilvopasture.eventbrite.com or call Schuyler CCE at 607-535-7161 for alternative registration.

During the September 8, 2011 Advanced Wheat Management Seminar in Batavia, staff from Cornell University and the WNY Crop Management Association as well as a number of producers covered a variety of topics. For that program, we developed economic analyses to examine the benefits and costs associated with an intensive wheat management system compared to a standard or base system.

We based analyses on Donn Branton’s experiences and results for the 2011 wheat crop, and estimated the expected change in profit associated with the intensive wheat management system practiced by Donn versus a program of standard practices. The intensive wheat management system can be described as an information intensive system utilizing tissue sampling, additional soil testing, scouting and crop consulting services to make decisions regarding nutrient, pesticides, and other inputs in a controlled traffic (tramline) system. Application method, rates, timing, and location (as they relate to input use) receive emphasis.

**Summary of Results**

- Intensive wheat management has the potential to increase value of production, income, but additional costs to realize that potential can be relatively large.

- For 2011, analysis suggests that an intensive system outperformed a standard system based upon the estimated change in profit attributed to intensive management. Analysis for 2010 concluded the same.

- Expected changes in profit are sensitive to a number of factors, such as expected price; expected increase in wheat yield; and expected input use decisions given growing conditions and resulting changes in input costs

*Estimating the Expected Change in Profit Using a Partial Budget*

One factor that producers use to evaluate possible changes in practices is the expected change in profit.

Profit equals the total value of production, income minus the costs of resources, inputs used in production. Expected change in profit equals the expected change in total value of production minus the expected change in costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partial Budget for Profit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensive Wheat Management System</strong> versus <strong>Current: Standard Wheat Program, 2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected wheat price ($/bushel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected change in wheat yield (bushel/acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straw quantity and quality unchanged. Average future year before tax analysis. Analysis is annual, per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items that Increase Profit:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Total Value of Production (TVP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops sold due to increased wheat yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of Items that Increase Profit (A):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items that Decrease Profit:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased TVP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizers, Nitrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fungicides, insecticides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 additional applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissue Samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting &amp; Drying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation: Nozzles, tram line controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor: Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of Items that Decrease Profit (B):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Change in Profit (A minus B):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysts construct a partial budget to estimate the expected change in profit associated with a proposed change in the farm business, such as a change from standard to intensive wheat management system.

Results

Expected changes in profit by expected yield increases by expected wheat prices range from negative $119 per acre to positive $60 per acre for 2011 conditions (Table 1). To illustrate some of the details of the analyses, the partial budget for an expected increase in yield of 30 bushels per acre, and $7.65 per bushel wheat price follows.

The intensive wheat management system outperformed the standard system in 2011 based upon the estimated change in profit of about $49 per acre attributed to the intensive management system. The intensive system outperformed the standard system in 2010 as well. However, the expected changes in profit were $126 and $49 and per acre for 2010 and 2011, respectively. Expected changes in total value of production were very similar for the two years—wheat prices were $8.00 and $7.65 per bushel for 2010 and 2011, respectively, while the expected additional yield was 30 bushels per acre for both years.

However, in 2011 the total additional cost to realize the additional income was considerably higher compared to 2010. Higher prices for some inputs, for example nitrogen, and greater input usage, for example, an additional fungicide application in 2011 compared to 2010, underlie the difference in expected change in profit.

Based upon the 2011 analyses, break even wheat yield increases are approximately 37, 30, 26, 22 additional bushels per acre for expected wheat prices of 5, 6, 7, and 8 dollars per bushel, respectively.

To learn more about this work contact John Hanchar. A MS Excel spreadsheet containing the analyses is available on the team’s website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Wheat Price: ($/bushel)</th>
<th>Expected Wheat Yield Increase (additional bu./acre)</th>
<th>-- $ per acre per year --</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-118.79</td>
<td>-74.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-108.79</td>
<td>-54.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>-98.79</td>
<td>-34.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-88.79</td>
<td>-14.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Expected Change in Annual Profit by Expected Wheat Yield Increase by Expected Wheat Price, 2011.
Ask Extension...

What is Silvopasturing?

by: Nancy Glazier

The practice of Silvopasturing is causing quite a buzz these days. It was a fairly new concept to me until a year and a half ago, a concept that brings together forestry management and grazing management into one single system of sustainable woodland grazing. Silvopasturing can be most readily defined as the purposeful and managed grazing of livestock in the woods. It can diversify income by utilizing products like trees, tree products, forage, and livestock. Yet it can also negatively impact the ecosystem and depreciate land through soil compaction, debarking of trees, and trampling and browsing of regeneration. The most important key for success is skilled management of the system.

In the modern world of invasive plants, high land ownership costs, and other challenges to healthy and sustainable woodlands, it is worth taking another look at livestock grazing as an acceptable and valuable tool for the management of some woodlots. Silvopasturing differs from the woodlot grazing of the past in that the frequency and intensity of the grazing is controlled to achieve the desired objectives. New fencing systems, a better understanding of animal behavior and the evolution of “management intensive grazing” have enabled us to gain the necessary level of control over livestock to achieve positive impacts from woodland grazing.

Silvopasturing isn’t for every woodland owner or every woodlot. It requires a commitment to caring for animals and enclosing portions of the woods with a secure fence to keep your animals in and predators out. Wooded areas on poor growing sites, rough terrain, or with difficult access would obviously have fewer advantages for successful silvopasturing than the converse. Skilled management requires considerable knowledge of both silviculture and grazing. If grazing and silviculture are the artful applications of science, then combining the two systems is certainly a fine art! But this shouldn’t discourage the novice from exploring the potential of silvopasturing on their property, even though results are likely to improve with increased skill and experience.

Upcoming Northeastern Silvopasture Conference

Cornell Cooperative Extension is providing an opportunity to learn more about the art of silvopasturing. The 2-day conference will be November 7 and 8, 2011. The event will be open to the public and held at the Watkins Glen Harbor Hotel, 16 North Franklin Street, Watkins Glen. Land use and conservation professionals, foresters, graziers, woodland owners and members of the academic community are especially encouraged to attend. The goals of the conference are to:

- Broaden a collective understanding of silvopasturing and its applications in the Northeastern US across multiple professions and stakeholders
- Identify opportunities and challenges to its implementation
- Develop networks for collaborative research, learning and promotion of silvopasturing activities

Every attempt is being made to keep the cost of the conference as reasonable as possible with support coming from National Agroforestry Center, Upper Susquehanna Coalition, Cornell’s Department of Natural Resources, Cornell’s Small Farms program, as well as others in the works. An agenda and registration for the event can be found online at http://nesilvopasture.eventbrite.com. A block of rooms are reserved at the hotel; contact them on the web at www.watkinsglenharborhotel.com or 607-535-6116. For more information on the event, give me a call – 585-315-7746.
Commitment to Quality & Service

at Reisdorf Bros. Inc
Since 1912, providing you quality feed and independent service for Western NY Farmers.

Full Line of Complete Feeds at Competitive Prices
“Exclusive” Extruded Full Fat Soybeans
“Steam Rolled” Flaked Corn
Customized Feeds and Complete Nutritional Feed Programs
Dairy Production Consultant
Full Line of Liquid Feed Supplements
Custom Spraying and Crop Service
Exclusive Manufacturer of “Country Magic Dog and Cat Food”
Working Relationships with Your Vet and Consultants for “YOUR Bottom Line,”
Plus Access to the Latest Technology in the Feed Nutrition Business

REISDORF
BROTHERS, INC.

Your Complete Farm Store & Feed Mill
1830 Perry Rd. North Java, NY 14113
Toll Free: 1.800.447.3717 585.535.7538 Fax: 585.535.0470

Please visit our website:
www.reisdorfbros.com
When I graduated from Cornell Vet College in 1977 there was an air of rugged individualism towards drug use (particularly antibiotics) in dairy cattle. We veterinarians had more products at our disposal than today. We used whatever was thought appropriate for the situation regardless of the label’s claim for species, application or dosage. We concocted various antibiotic combinations in large volumes to treat mastitis – all with their own color and mysterious names or numbers. We still had some eyebrow-raising, old-time medicines that contained strychnine, arsenic, atropine and potent botanicals. In reality some of these remedies did a fine job, others probably were highly overrated. The veterinary community at that time both controlled the decision for use and in many instances the administration of most drugs both OTC and script.

Today the landscape had changed greatly. Vets do not treat most animals. In most cases they do not even make the diagnosis. Public opinion has become cynical of food quality and drug residues. The FDA responded years ago with the elimination of many previously “grandfathered” products that lacked scientific safety and efficacy studies now required. Surveillance for the antibiotics in particular became easier with the advances in detection technology. On the positive side for the dairy industry, the level of violative residues significantly dropped during the heightened screening era.

After coming down hard on the “off-label” use of medications by veterinarians, the Congress passed the Animal Medicinal Drug Use Act (AMDUA) in 1994. This gave vets (and vets alone) the authority to use or prescribe drugs for a species not on the label, for a higher dose rate than indicated and for a longer period of treatment than recommended. There were and are certain exceptions. There are prohibited drugs that under no circumstances can be used – period – in food producing animals. Chloramphenicol is one of the earliest examples. There are drugs that must be used exactly as stated on the label with regard to species, dose, duration and age. Baytril is one of the more recent examples.

AMDUCA to the veterinarian is a double edged sword. It allows us to retain flexibility in treating infectious diseases and other ailments that could have been lost for good. It also comes with great responsibility. Withholdings for milk and meat must be “a conservative estimate of drug residue level in edible animal tissue derived from food safety data and scientific information”. That says no guessing! Fortunately, there is FARAD, the Food Animal Residue Avoidance & Depletion Program, a USDA sponsored project to help with these decisions.

One can argue whether the trend towards zero tolerance for anything foreign in our food is warranted. What aspects of our lives are guaranteed free of risk of any degree of significance? It is remarkable and comforting at the same time to know that vastly improved environmental conditions, better nutritional programs and more effective vaccines have really taken the reliance on antibiotics down a few notches.

We will still need to address public concern for dairy residues. The random expanded testing of milk that is now on hold will be back. There will always be a need to go to the bench and use a potent, extra-label product for an unusual case or two. We need to make sure that protocols are in place and followed for such use. The dairyman needs to be protected from residue issues as well as their veterinarian who places his reputation and license on the line to allow this to happen.

Producers must work with their veterinarians to maintain required labeling, storage, record keeping, dosing and identification of treated animals. It is part of the mandated Veterinary Client Patient Relationship that allows the benefits of extra-label drug use.
Cow Centered Housing Discussion Group

by Joan Sinclair Petzen

Are you thinking about renovating, remodeling or building cow facilities?

Through participation in this discussion group you will have the opportunity to explore options for improving cow comfort in existing facilities, addressing animal wellbeing and comfort when building new cow housing and management strategies for enhancing cow performance.

Potential Discussion Topics:
- Evaluating Dairy Facilities with Animal Wellbeing in Mind
- The Aerial Environment – Fresh Air & Plenty of It
- Solar Energy Options for Today’s Dairies
- Feed and Water System Design and Management
- Hot Weather Management
- Design and Management of Quality Resting Areas
- The Relationship Between Flooring, Footing & Lameness

Through participation in this discussion group you will have the opportunity to explore options for improving cow comfort in existing facilities, addressing animal wellbeing and comfort when building new cow housing and management strategies for enhancing cow performance.

Interested in these topics? Contact Jerry Bertoldo at 585-343-3040, Ext. 133 or grb23@cornell.edu or Jackson Wright at 585-394-3977 or jbw243@cornell.edu to learn more about these discussions. Facilitated discussion groups will meet monthly to explore these topics and more related to animal wellbeing and comfort and facility design.

Dairy Skills Training
Bovine Reproduction & A. I. Course

2-day course involves classroom time & practice with cows.

Cost: $150.00 per person

Cost includes lunches & reference manual.
(STarter A.I. kit available @ additional cost)

November 7 & 8, 2011
Spring Hope Farm, County Route 4, Seneca Castle 14547
9:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m. each day

November 9 & 10, 2011
Synergy Dairy, 6534 Lemley Road, Wyoming 14591
9:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m. each day

Registration & payment required by: November 4
Call Cathy: 585.343.3040 x138 or cfw6@cornell.edu

In collaboration with: Genex/CRI & Wyoming County Dairy Institute
Mycotoxins affect your business whether you are a producer, nutritionist or veterinarian. Understanding the impact of mycotoxins helps protect animal health, productivity and ultimately the bottom line. The KnowMycotoxins.com website brings you valuable information on this growing problem in the feed industry. KnowMycotoxins.com is the first website to address the most frequently asked questions and concerns of producers, nutritionists and veterinarians.

It’s simple.
Alltech Knows Mycotoxins.

www.knowmycotoxins.com
Alltech PA 717-393-9545
sanderson@alltech.com
Farmer’s Guide to the Conservation Stewardship Program

The National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition (NSAC) releases an updated version of our popular Farmers’ Guide to the Conservation Stewardship Program. The Guide is intended to help family farmers, ranchers, and foresters understand the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP) enrollment process. In addition, it provides clear information on conservation activities eligible for CSP payments to improve conservation performance and environmental benefits.

The CSP is a whole farm and comprehensive working lands conservation program administered by USDA’s Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). Its primary focus is management practices. The philosophy of the program is captured by the subtitle of the Farmers’ Guide – Rewarding farmers for how they grow what they grow.

The revised Guide includes step-by-step enrollment guidance, key definitions, and helpful hints. It also includes a new five-page section with data analysis of the program’s first two sign-up periods in 2009 and 2010. This data section includes analysis of program participation by geographic region, land use type, commodity type, and the top conservation practices and enhancements chosen by farmers and ranchers who have enrolled in the program. The guide can be found at www.sustainableagriculture.net/publications. A printed copy may be purchased by calling (202) 547-5754.

Proposed Changes in Agricultural Child Labor Laws

On September 2, 2011 DOL published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to update the agricultural child labor regulations to bring them into the 21st century based upon recommendations made by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, its own enforcement experience, and a commitment to bring these rules in line with the more stringent rules that apply to employing children in nonagricultural workplaces.

The public is invited to provide comments to DOL on these important proposals. Comments must be received by November 1, 2011.

For more information, including a fact sheet and the DOL’s extensive list of proposed rules, contact Cathy Wallace at 585.343.3040 ext. 138.
Are you Ready to Combine?

Below are 10 tips put together by the University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension to make sure your combine is running right from the start. Remember, just two kernels on the ground per foot equates to a bushel lost per acre! This article can be found at http://corn.agronomy.wisc.edu/Management/L036.aspx.

1. Be sure the crop is ready to harvest. Test for grain moisture percentage.

2. The combine must be correctly adjusted and equipped for the crop to be harvested. Inspect rasp bars for chips, bends, or cracks. Replace as necessary. Start with initial settings for the crop from the operator’s manual.

3. To get the maximum efficiency without grain loss, the header must be operated efficiently. Use the proper size header for the machine and know the adjustments needed to achieve best results. Read the header operator’s manual for specific adjustments.

4. Operate at full throttle. All drives of the combine are based at governed engine speed.

5. Keep an even, uniform flow of material moving through the combine. When the combine is running near empty or taking in bunches of crop material, increased grain losses and grain damage are likely.

6. Select a ground speed that will not overload the combine or overrun the header’s ability to do its job. Observe the engine overload monitor. When engine speed is reduced, cleaning system speed is reduced also.

7. Use the correct cylinder/rotor speed and concave clearance to properly thresh and separate the crop being harvested. Excessive cylinder speed is the leading cause of grain damage - always use the lowest possible setting to achieve the best total threshing. Always try to eliminate unthreshed losses by adjusting concave clearance first rather than cylinder speed.

8. The sieves must be open far enough to let all grain through. The chaffer sieve should allow all grain and unthreshed cobs/pods/heads through. The shoe sieve below should let only threshed grain through, so that the unthreshed portion goes to tailings and is returned to the rotor cage to be rethreshed. If the chaffer setting is too open, it overloads the shoe. If the shoe sieve is too tight, tailings will increase; if it is too open, the grain in the tank will be dirty. Set sieve to widest recommended setting and work back if required.

9. Wind blast through the sieves should be strong enough to remove all particles lighter than grain. Too little air from the fan causes shoe overload, high tailings and sloughing of the crop. Set fan to highest speed recommended and work down if required.

10. Check all augers for wear because grain handling can increase seed damage also check grain cart). Proper rotor speed, concave clearance, fan setting and sieve adjustment will reduce the amount of tailings. Tailings should include only unthreshed particles. Above all else, perform only one adjustment at a time to minimize your time spent adjusting to optimum performance.

Read your operator’s manual thoroughly for detailed settings for your specific combine model. Attend combine clinics to learn fine-tuning methods from other combine operators.
October 2011
28 Sheep & Goat Symposium, Pre-Symposium Practical’s, 11:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m., Cornell Sheep Farm, Harford, NY. For more information, contact: Vicki Badalamenti: 607.255.7712
29 Sheep & Goat Symposium, Saturday, October 29, 7:45 a.m. - 6:00 p.m., Morrison Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca

November 2011
7-8 Northeastern Silvopasture Conference, Harbor Hotel, 16 N. Franklin Street, Watkins Glen, NY 14891
21 Field Crop Dealer Meeting, 9:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m., Geneva Experiment Station, Jordan Hall

Upcoming Programs...

Annual Feed Dealer’s Meetings - Drs. Larry Chase & Tom Overton
11:00 a.m. - 2:30 p.m. each day
Thursday, November 3, Hidden Valley Lodge, 2416 Royce Rd., Varysburg, NY 14167
Friday, November 4, Blue Ribbon Smoke House & Restaurant, 261 Main St., Phelps, NY 14532
Lunch & proceedings included, Cost: $30 per person/location, $25 ea. Additional person(s) from same company/farm
Pre-Registration is Requested!
Contact: Cathy Wallace: 585.343.3040 x138 or cfw6@cornell.edu

Group Housed Dairy Calf Systems Symposium
December 1, Doubletree Hotel, Syracuse, NY
Details coming in November’s Ag Focus or go to www.anisci.cornell.edu/prodairy/calfsystems
For information on speakers, agenda, registration & hotel

Check out our website for articles related to:
corn crop, flooding, yield, pricing and quality

“Cornell University Cooperative Extension provides equal program and employment opportunities.”