

2018

Evaluation of Salt, Trace Mineral Sources, and Growth Implants on Performance of Stocker Cattle Grazing Native Flint Hills Pasture

C. S. Weibert

Kansas State University, ccsweibert@k-state.edu

T. J. Spore

Kansas State University, tjspore@ksu.edu

M. A. Johnson

Kansas State University, marissajo@k-state.edu

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/kaesrr>

 Part of the [Other Animal Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Weibert, C. S.; Spore, T. J.; Johnson, M. A.; Brazle, F. K.; Kuhl, G. L.; Hollenbeck, W. R.; Wahl, R. N.; and Blasi, Dale (2018) "Evaluation of Salt, Trace Mineral Sources, and Growth Implants on Performance of Stocker Cattle Grazing Native Flint Hills Pasture," *Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports*: Vol. 4: Iss. 1. <https://doi.org/10.4148/2378-5977.7537>

This report is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. Copyright 2018 the Author(s). Contents of this publication may be freely reproduced for educational purposes. All other rights reserved. Brand names appearing in this publication are for product identification purposes only. No endorsement is intended, nor is criticism implied of similar products not mentioned. K-State Research and Extension is an equal opportunity provider and employer.



Evaluation of Salt, Trace Mineral Sources, and Growth Implants on Performance of Stocker Cattle Grazing Native Flint Hills Pasture

Authors

C. S. Weibert, T. J. Spore, M. A. Johnson, F. K. Brazle, G. L. Kuhl, W. R. Hollenbeck, R. N. Wahl, and Dale Blasi

Evaluation of Salt, Trace Mineral Sources, and Growth Implants on Performance of Stocker Cattle Grazing Native Flint Hills Pasture

*C.S. Weibert, T.J. Spore, M.A. Johnson, F.K. Brazle,¹ G.L. Kuhl,²
W.R. Hollenbeck, R.N. Wahl, and D.A. Blasi*

Introduction

Graber et al. (1985) studied mineral supplementation with stockers grazing Flint Hills native grass pastures and concluded that improvements in performance may or may not occur when investing in this management practice. While most stocker operations today utilize some source of complete mineral, some producers use only salt while their calves are on pasture. The objective of this study was to determine the efficacy of providing salt alone or with injectable trace minerals compared to a complete mineral supplement and growth implants for improving the growth of stocker calves grazing native grass pastures in the Flint Hills region of Kansas.

Experimental Procedures

Crossbred steers originating from Texas and New Mexico ($n = 248$; $697.8 \text{ lb} \pm 9.6$) were randomized by initial weight across 15 pastures. All steers in this study were previously used in a receiving study that focused on limit feeding either wet distillers grains or corn gluten feed at 2% of their body weight (Spore et al., 2018). The final weights of the receiving trial were used to randomly assign each animal to a treatment.

Pastures were randomly assigned to three different treatment groups: (1) Salt block only; (2) Salt block and Multimin90; and (3) a Kansas State University complete mineral (Brazle, personal communication; Table 1) formulated for 3 oz/day daily consumption. Multimin90 is an injectable chelated aqueous supplemental source of trace minerals administered at 1 mL/100 lb body weight (1 mL contains 60 mg zinc, 10 mg manganese, 5 mg selenium, and 15 mg copper).

Within each pasture treatment group, equal number of steers were randomly given either: Ralgro (36 mg zeranol) or Revalor-G implants (40 mg of trenbolone acetate and 8 mg estradiol; Merck Animal Health, Madison, NJ), or no implant. Stocking rates

¹ Retired Kansas State University Southeast Area Livestock Specialist, Chanute, KS.

² Retired K-State Research and Extension Beef Specialist, Nutrition and Management, Manhattan, KS.

were based on pasture size (avg: 250 lb/acre $\pm$ 5.2). All steers were weighed individually on days 0 and 90.

On a weekly basis, the mineral feeders and salt blocks were weighed to determine consumption. The collected data were used to calculate the previous week's intake of mineral. Consumed mineral was replaced and the distance to a water source was adjusted as needed to achieve 3 oz per head daily target. The movement and opening of mineral feeders were done in pasture blocks to ensure intake differences were due to mineral and not to human error.

All calves were inspected multiple times weekly throughout the trial for pinkeye, lameness, and other ailments. If diagnosed with foot rot or pinkeye, cattle received Bio-Myocin 200. Upon conclusion of the study, all steers were weighed and placed in a small pasture overnight before shipping to a commercial feedlot.

Data were analyzed using the MIXED procedure (version 9.4, SAS Inst. Inc., Cary, NC). Data were arranged in a randomized incomplete block design, with pasture serving as the experimental unit for growth and health outcomes as impacted by treatment. In the model, the fixed effects were treatment and pasture while the random effects were pasture $\times$ treatment, pasture, and animal identification.

Results and Discussion

There were no statistical interactions; therefore, only the main effects of mineral supplementation and implant are presented in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. There were no significant differences in average daily gain ($P=0.40$) from salt or mineral supplementation (Table 2). It should be noted that all steers in this study were previously used in a 90-day growing study with diets well-fortified with macro and trace minerals that may have influenced the results observed. The results in Table 4 show the forage quality at three time points of the experimental pastures during the course of the experiment. Overall, the crude protein levels in the complete salt and mineral supplement pastures were significantly higher ($P<0.02$) than the other two treatments.

Compared to non-implants, calves gained significantly faster when implanted with either Revalor-G or Ralgro (average of 8.9%, $P=0.02$). The average block salt intake was approximately 1.43 oz/head daily while the daily intake of the K-State complete mineral was 3.3 oz/head. Salt and complete mineral intakes of the stockers were fairly consistent throughout the 13-week trial, with greater usage rates associated with periods of high precipitation (Figure 1). Two calves were pulled or treated during the course of the trial; one for a broken leg and the other for lameness.

Implications

While there was no growth response to salt block and injectable trace mineral supplementation when compared to a complete mineral supplementation, there was a significant growth response with growth implants.

References

- Gradber, R.W., E.F. Smith, C.E. Owensby, J. Riley, and R.R. Schalles. Mineral, Rumensin, and chlortetracycline supplementation for steers on native bluestem pasture. Cattlemen's Day 1985, Kansas State University, March 1985. Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Report SRP470, pages 8-11.
- Spore, T.J., S.P. Montgomery, E.C. Titgemeyer, G.A. Hanzlicek, C.I. Vahl, T.G. Nagaraja, W.R. Hollenbeck, R.N. Wahl, and D.A. Blasi. Wet distiller's grains and wet corn gluten with dry-rolled or whole-shelled corn in high-energy limit-fed diets do not affect growing cattle performance. Cattlemen's Day 2018, Kansas State University, March 2018. Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports. Vol. 4. Iss. 1.

Table 1. K-State complete mineral^{1,2}

Ingredient	lb per ton
Dicalcium phosphate	450
White salt	650
Ground limestone	350
Dried distillers grains	349
Dried molasses	100
Magnesium oxide	40
Mineral/soybean oil	20
Zinc oxide	20
Copper sulfate	10
Vitamin A (30,000 IU/g)	10
Iodine (EDDI)	1
Total	2000

Mineral	Calculated concentration in mineral
Calcium, %	11.9
Phosphorus, %	3.9
Magnesium, %	1.3
Potassium, %	0.6
Salt, %	32.5
Sulfur, %	0.2
Copper, ppm	1,278
Cobalt, ppm	0.2
Iodine, ppm	394
Iron, ppm	126
Manganese, ppm	6.1
Vitamin A, kIU/lb	68.1
Zinc, ppm	7,812

¹Designed for a 650-lb steer; 3 oz intake per day.

²Dr. Frank Brazle, 2017, personal communication.

Table 2. Effects of mineral supplementation on stocker performance

Item	Mineral supplementation			Standard error of mean ¹
	Salt block	Salt block and injectable trace mineral	Complete salt and mineral supplement	
Number of pastures	5	5	5	
Day 0 weight, lb	698	695	700	9.6
Day 90 weight, lb	847	838	856	13.6
Average daily gain, lb	1.63	1.61	1.73	0.07

¹Greatest standard error of the mean among treatments reported.

Table 3. Effects of implant on stocker performance

Item	Growth implant			Standard error of mean ¹
	No implant	Ralgro	Revalor-G	
Number of steers	82	82	81	
Day 0 weight, lb	693	699	702	7.9
Day 90 weight, lb	830	857	855	10.9
Average daily gain, lb	1.53 ^a	1.75 ^b	1.70 ^c	0.07

¹Greatest standard error of the mean among treatments reported.

^{a,b,c}Means within a row with uncommon superscripts differ (P<0.05).

Table 4. Forage quality of Flint Hills pasture by date of sampling^{ab}

Nutrient composition	May 16			June 16			July 31			Standard error of the mean	P-value ^b
	Salt block	Salt block and inject-able trace mineral	Complete salt and mineral supplement	Salt block	Salt block and inject-able trace mineral	Complete salt and mineral supplement	Salt block	Salt block and inject-able trace mineral	Complete salt and mineral supplement		
Dry matter, %	32.20	37.30	31.90	41.10	41.40	41.70	49.70	47.90	51.70	2.14	0.79
Crude protein, %	11.87	10.90	13.56	7.68	7.82	8.36	5.40	5.96	6.11	0.50	0.02
Acid detergent fiber, %	35.80	39.90	35.00	38.10	38.10	37.00	40.70	43.70	40.80	0.91	0.0001
Neutral detergent fiber, %	57.30	57.70	55.70	61.70	61.10	59.50	64.20	65.50	61.50	1.40	0.07
Net energy-maintenance, Mcal/lb	0.50	0.41	0.52	0.46	0.46	0.47	0.40	0.33	0.39	0.01	0.0001
Net energy gain, Mcal/lb	0.25	0.17	0.26	0.21	0.20	0.23	0.15	0.09	0.15	0.02	0.0001
Total digestible nutrients, %	54.20	48.60	55.30	51.10	51.10	52.50	47.60	43.50	47.40	1.20	0.0001
Calcium, %	0.66	0.80	0.67	0.58	0.62	0.71	0.68	0.69	0.92	0.07	0.21
Phosphorus, %	0.18	0.20	0.21	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.01	0.31
Potassium, %	1.80	1.60	1.85	1.38	1.51	1.41	0.91	0.96	1.03	0.13	0.74
Magnesium, %	0.18	0.19	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.16	0.21	0.21	0.02	0.30
Sodium, %	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.24	0.01	0.08	0.39
Sulfur, %	0.12	0.13	0.16	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.01	0.10
Cobalt, ppm	0.39	0.39	0.47	0.54	0.46	0.54	0.24	0.31	0.33	0.08	0.52
Copper, ppm	7.30	7.60	8.10	4.20	4.20	5.10	4.70	5.30	5.55	0.58	0.25
Manganese, ppm	45.30	36.60	46.30	26.20	27.60	29.90	30.50	39.60	44.40	6.60	0.55
Molybdenum, ppm	1.02	1.16	1.25	0.82	0.67	0.93	1.26	1.57	1.54	0.18	0.31
Zinc, ppm	24.30	27.30	25.70	13.00	12.60	16.00	18.10	20.00	25.70	2.37	0.20

^aEach value represents the average of 5 forage samples. One sample was collected from each treatment pasture per time period and composited into one sample.

^bSignificance by date of sampling.




Figure 1. Calculated intake of salt and mineral provided to steers.

* = Estimated values obtained from Climate Fieldview.