AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
http://ageconsearch.umn.edu
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Biofuels, Food & Feed Tradeoffs

Proceedings of a conference April 12-13, 2007, in St. Louis, Missouri.

Edited by

Joe L. Outlaw

Agricultural and Food Policy Center
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX

James A. Duffield

Office of Energy Policy and New Uses
US Department of Agriculture
Washington, DC

David P. Ernstes

Agricultural and Food Policy Center
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX

Sponsored by

Farm Foundation
USDA Rural Development
USDA's Office of Energy Policy and New Uses

75 Farm Foundation
SINCE 1933

The Interaction Between Ethanol and Cattle Feeding: Economics and Issues

David P. Anderson, Erin Daley and Joe L. Outlaw[1]

Introduction

By-products have long been a feed source for livestock. From the time cattlemen started "cattle feeding," by-products have been utilized to reduce the cost of gain, especially in the finishing ration. With the current expansion of the ethanol industry, another by-product feed, or co-product of ethanol production, distiller's grains, is becoming more available to livestock feeders.

Over the years, the cattle feeding industry has spread from the Corn Belt with each area having its own specific competitive advantages. The top four cattle feeding states are Texas, Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado. Nebraska and Kansas grow surplus grain while Texas and Colorado are corn deficit states. Texas and Colorado use the railroad system to secure corn supplies from the Midwest to meet their feed demands. Regional differences in feeding technologies, location to feed sources, and market infrastructure are prime determinants in the impact of distiller's grains feeding.

This research evaluates the potential impact of increasing ethanol and distiller's grains production on the beef cattle feeding industry. Geographic differences and specific regional implications for beef cattle feedlots in the top four cattle feeding states are analyzed. Implications for the feed deficit states, Texas and Colorado, are compared with Nebraska and Kansas that have abundant ethanol production. Regional differences in feedlot equipment and ration composition that are affected by the feedlot's proximity to ethanol production are included in the analysis. Feedlot distance to distiller's grains production is included.

Background

Economic implications of the potential tradeoff between corn and ethanol co-products in feedlot rations have not been extensively analyzed. Feed is the single most costly component of finishing cattle, often representing 70% to 80% of the total cost of gain. It takes approximately 55 bushels (bu) of corn to raise a feeder calf to harvest, where every pound (lb) of beef produced requires 5.6 lb of corn (US Meat Export Federation, 2006). Distiller's grains replace a portion of the corn, as well as supplemental protein, like soybean meal (SBM), potentially reducing ration costs (Erickson, 2005).

There have been numerous studies on the nutritional aspects of distiller's grains, but, for the most part, specific regional economic aspects of feeding distiller's grains have not been considered. Nutritional research has shown optimum inclusion rates for wet distiller's grains (WDGS) ranging between 25% and 35% of ration dry matter (Vander Pol *et al.*, 2006b) in Eastern Nebraska, while Daubert *et al.* (2006) found optimal levels between 8% and 16% for cattle fed in Kansas. Texas studies have shown less favorable results from including distiller's grains in steam-flaked corn (SFC) based feedlot rations (Cole *et al.*, 2006). Differences in cattle performance are generally attributed to variations in co-product quality and nutrient content and varying energy values of corn from different processing methods in the base ration.

Although variability of fed cattle and feeder cattle prices have greater impacts on cattle feeding profitability than corn prices; corn price, feed conversion, and average daily gain (ADG) explained 65%, 27%, and 2% of cost-of-gain variability (Albright *et al.*, 1994). In general, as placement weight increases, feeder cattle prices impact profitability relatively more than corn prices, interest rates, and animal performance. Feed conversion influences profitability more for winter placements while ADG has a greater impact on profits for late winter/early spring placements (Mark, *et al.*, 2000).

The co-products from wet and dry mill ethanol processing plants have substantially different nutrient contents and feeding characteristics requiring separate economic consideration. Ethanol expansion is primarily occurring in the dry mill industry generating WDGS or dry distiller's grains (DDGS).

WDGS has a short useful life and spoils quickly due to its high water and fat content. The minimal three to six day shelf life of WDGS limits its use and can add extra preservation and storage costs to the feed product. The excess water weight (up to 70% water) adds significantly to transportation costs, limiting the profitable feeding radius around the ethanol plant. A ton of WDGS may contain up to 1,300 lb of water, which must be hauled to and handled at the feedlot. Although

[1] Anderson is an associate professor and extension economist and Outlaw is co-director, professor and extension economist at the Agricultural and Food Policy Center, Department of Agricultural Economics, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas. Daley is manager, research and analysis, with the US Meat Export Federation, Denver, Colorado.

List of Abbreviations.

ADG	Average daily gain
DDGS	Dry distiller's grains
DRC	Dry rolled corn
HMC	Ensiled high moisture corn
SBM	Soybean meal
SFC	Steam flaked corn
WCDG	Corn-based wet distiller's grains
WCGF	Wet corn gluten feed
WDGS	Wet distiller's grains
WSDG	Sorghum-based wet distiller's grains

the extra moisture in the ration has a positive effect on cattle performance, the increased handling and transportation costs are significant considerations (Erickson, 2006).

Wet-mill ethanol plants produce a variety of co-products, but cattle feeders primarily use wet corn gluten feed (WCGF). WCGF is lower in protein and fat than distiller's grains and its energy is primarily derived from highly digestible fiber.

Perrin and Klopfenstein's (2001) research at the University of Nebraska used a combination of experimental results, survey data, and market prices to compare the average value of feeding WCGF to the dried product. The average calculated value of the WCGF was $130/ton of dry matter during the 1990's, compared to the alternative value as dried feed of $93/ton. One ton of WDGS on a dry matter basis primarily replaced 0.03 tons of alfalfa hay and 49.8 bu of dry rolled corn and had a total value of $140.03/ton.

Haugen and Hughes (1997) analyzed the economic implications of feeding different levels of WCGF in a 1,000-head capacity North Dakota beef feedlot by integrating feeding trial data with input and output prices. The different percentages of WCGF in the feedlot rations resulted in significantly different net returns due to changes in gross margin (based on pounds gained per animal), feed costs, operating margin, hauling costs, shrink, and death loss. Many factors influenced the net return, including biological effects of the ration measured as gain per day and feed efficiency. The 56% ration (as compared to 0%, 28%, and 85% WCGF) showed the highest economic return per head for each corn price and the best biological effect.

Vander Pol *et al.* (2006b) conducted an economic comparison for cattle fed 0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, and 50% WDGS in dry rolled (DRC)/high moisture (HMC)-based corn rations. Corn was evaluated using a 10-year average price, with either a $0.05/bu or $0.10/bu increase in price to represent the higher basis on corn near an ethanol plant. WDGS prices were estimated at 95% of the price of corn at the ethanol plant. Scenarios were compared for feedlots surrounding the plant, and within 30, 60, and 100 miles of the plant at $2.50/loaded mile.

The results showed the optimum inclusion rate for feedlot producers is 30% to 40% of diet dry matter when feedlots are within 30 miles of the ethanol plant. As the distance increases from the plant to the feedlot, the optimum inclusion of WDGS decreases to between 20% and 30%. This comparison suggests that WDGS can be fed at higher levels than the current industry inclusion rate. However, the optimum inclusion is dependent on the WDGS energy value, price, cattle performance, distance from the plant, and corn price (Vander Pol *et al.*, 2006b).

Feedlot rations and feed management are largely based on the corn processing method utilized. The most common corn processing methods, from least to most intensive, are dry rolling, early harvest high moisture (HMC) ensiling, and steam flaking (Macken, *et al.*, 2006). Steam flaking results in the highest energy value relative to the other corn processing methods, but is also the most costly processing method (Macken, *et al.*, 2006; and Cooper *et al.*, 2001). Steam flaking is primarily utilized in corn deficit areas, like the Texas panhandle (Cole *et al.*, 2006) and Eastern Colorado to maximize the feed energy value of corn. Where corn is available at lower prices, *i.e.* Eastern Nebraska, feedlots use the less expensive, less intensive processing methods (DRC and HMC).

Galyean and Lemon (2006) conducted a study to determine the optimal dietary concentration of WDGS in SFC-based finishing diets. They also compared the feeding value of sorghum-based wet distiller's grains (WSDG) with corn-based wet distiller's grains (WCDG). The importance of the SFC ration for this research is that the Texas cattle feeding industry predominately feeds SFC. Galyean and Lemon (2006) found a linear decrease in ADG as the dietary concentration of WSDG increased. Unlike previous studies (Larson *et al.*, 1993; Ham *et al.*, 1994; and Lodge *et al.*, 1997) which reported improved feed efficiency in cattle fed distiller's grains, they found a linear increase in the feed to gain ratio, meaning poorer feed conversion, with increasing WSDG concentrations. These results also differ from those of Daubert *et al.* (2005), who fed SFC-based diets containing WSDG to heifers. Peak performance occurred at the 8% and 16% inclusion rates, and performance decreased significantly with higher

DG concentrations. Lodge *et al.* (1997) also found a decrease in ADG and feed efficiency for cattle fed a higher concentration of dried sorghum distiller's grains.

Drouillard *et al.* (2006) compared the feeding value of WDGS and DDGS in SFC-based diets and also evaluated the roughage value of distiller's grains. The trial rations included 15% (dry matter basis) wet or dry sorghum distiller's grain with solubles (WDSG or DSDG) and wet and dry corn-based distiller's grains. Roughage value was evaluated by feeding wet sorghum distiller's grain with 0% and 6% alfalfa hay (where SFC replaced alfalfa in the 0% hay ration). Drouillard *et al.* (2006) found wet and dry distiller's grains with solubles derived from sorghum and corn have comparable nutritional values. Removal of alfalfa hay from wet and dry sorghum-based distiller's grains rations adversely affected dry matter intake, ADG, and final body weight.

Feeding equipment used for processing and feeding dry rations (using steamflaked corn) are significantly different from equipment used to handle Nebraska's wet rations. In Nebraska, ration ingredients are placed in Roto-mix® mixer-delivery box trucks using front end loaders then mixed in the trucks on the way to the feed bunks. When feed mills are used to produce SFC based rations, the dry ingredients are mixed in the feed mill and then loaded directly onto the feed trucks. Therefore, no mixing occurs on the feed trucks. If WDGS were incorporated into these types of rations, it could not be mixed in the feed mill because of its high water content requiring new truck purchases (Erickson, 2006).

For cattle feeders located further from ethanol production, DDGS could be an economical feed source, where handling, storage, and transportation costs are lower than for WDGS. The dry co-product could be mixed in the feed mills and therefore requires less extra handling costs and equipment changes for Texas feeders. Feedlot nutrition studies have shown that DDGS should be fed at lower inclusion rates than WDGS and generally limited to 15% of the ration on a dry matter basis (Drouillard *et al.*, 2006). At inclusion rates greater than 15%, ration mixing problems can occur because the high fat content of DDGS can inhibit flow-ability. Also, at the 15% inclusion rate, DDGS replaces dietary protein sources, but, at higher inclusion rates, it would compete with cheaper energy sources (Erickson, 2006).

The nutritional attributes of DDGS for dairy and beef cattle include high levels of bypass protein and a highly digestible combination of fiber and fat, making DDGS a highly desirable ingredient for ruminant diets. DDGS can be a substitute for corn or SBM in ruminant rations, but DDGS protein is of lower quality than SBM. Because ethanol is produced from the starch in corn, the energy in distiller's grains comes from digestible fiber and fat instead of starch. Ruminal starch fermentation is more likely to result in acidosis, laminitis, and fatty liver, so the removal of starch results in a valuable feed product (Schroeder, 2003).

The limitations of DDGS are its low level of amino acid content, especially lysine and tryptophan, giving SBM the advantage in protein quality. At a higher percentage of the diet (>50%), additional fat limits the inclusion of distiller's grains in feedlot rations. The high phosphorus content of DDGS can also be a concern due to manure phosphorus levels. The cost of supplementing calcium must also be considered. Beef cattle rations need a calcium to phosphorus ratio of 1: 1 to 1.5: 1 otherwise the negative effects include a potential for water belly steers as well as increased phosphorus levels in manure (Shurson and Noll, 2005). High sulfur levels are another concern when feeding large amounts of DDGS. If DDGS has a high sulfur content, thiamin should be supplemented, especially if water sources also contain sulfur (Erickson, 2006).

In summary, the existing feeding research sets a base for comparison to current used feed rations. It is clear that cattle performance is key to feeding distiller's grains. Performance gains can partially offset the high costs of corn. In addition, there are some challenges in terms of feeding infrastructure that must be incorporated into any analysis.

Methods

Historical data was used to develop a partial budget model for beef feedlots. The partial budget includes ration costs and feeding (yardage) costs representing feedlots in Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, and Texas. Ration costs are a function of ingredient prices, ration composition, and cattle performance (dry matter intake). Historical price data from *Feedstuffs* was used to estimate ration ingredient prices. Feedlot data from the Professional Cattle Consultants (PCC), a private feedlot consulting company, was used to estimate feed efficiency, ADG, dry feed conversion, daily dry matter intake, veterinary/medical expenses, and other key variables for each region.

Changes in cattle performance resulting from feeding two different levels of WDGS and one level of DDGS were estimated by adjusting historical ADG, feed efficiency, and dry matter intake (from PCC data) by the results found in feedlot nutrition studies reviewed above. Nutrition research results account for the regional changes in cattle performance with the corresponding ration composition incorporating distiller's grains. Manure management costs correlated with feeding WDGS (and corresponding increases in dietary phosphorus levels) were estimated from Kissinger *et al.* (2006) results.

Feed costs are estimated for a base ration without distillers' grains, and both WDGS and DDGS at two dietary inclusion rates in a total of four rations for Kansas and Nebraska,

Table 1: Exogenous and Endogenous Variables in Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, and Texas Feedlot Models Incorporating Ethanol By-Products.

Exogenous Stochastic	Exogenous Deterministic
PCC Data	Steers Placed
Average Daily Gain	Purchase Weight
Feed: Gain	Days on Feed
Dry Matter Intake	Yardage
Vet/Med Costs	Manure Hauling
Feedstuffs Data	**Endogenous Stochastic**
Corn	Total Feed
Soybean Meal	Total Gain
Cottonseed Meal	Out-weight
Cottonseed Hulls	Total Cost of Feeding
Corn Gluten Feed	Corn Processing Costs
DDGS	Transportation of WDGS
WDGS	WDGS Feeding Costs
Alfalfa Pellets	**WDGS Investment Costs**
Corn Silage	Roto-mix
Urea	Front End Loader Operator Salary
Yellow Grease	Roto-mix Driver Salary
Molasses	Repair, Maintenance, Insurance, Fuel

and seven rations for Colorado and Texas, where SFC based rations are compared to DRC based rations. SFC and DRC processing costs are estimated from Macken, *et al.* (2006) results. Natural gas and electricity price data were obtained from the Department of Energy (Energy Information Administration, 2006). Trucking costs obtained from the Agricultural Marketing Service Grain Transportation 1st Quarter 2006 Report were used to estimate WDGS hauling costs (Agricultural Marketing Service, 2006).

A stochastic partial budget simulation model, using Simetar®, was developed for each feedlot region, with cost of gain as the key output variable (Richardson, 2005). Stochastic simulation adds risk to a deterministic model by estimating a variable's probability distribution which can be used by a decision maker in a risky environment. The deterministic and stochastic variables are contained in Table 1.

Two cattle on feed placement months, May and October, were analyzed to capture any differing effects caused by calf feds and heavier feeder cattle placements. The two weight groups and corresponding months were used to account for seasonal cattle performance and feed cost differences when determining whether changing ration costs and compositions have different implications for lighter (fall) versus heavier weight (spring) placements.

WDGS prices were estimated as a percentage of the local corn basis at the ethanol plant. To estimate the ethanol plant's corn basis, a $0.15/bu premium was assumed for corn within 25 miles of an ethanol plant, representing the increased demand for corn (Vander Pol *et al.*, 2006b). WDGS prices were estimated as 95% of corn price, on an equal dry matter basis.

Alternative Ration Scenarios

Base regional ration ingredients were adjusted to incorporate DDGS at 15% of the diet dry matter and WDGS at 15% and 30% of the diet dry matter. DDGS and WDGS primarily replace corn and the protein supplement (SBM, cottonseed meal, or urea). Previous feedlot nutrition studies were used to determine ration adjustments for the incorporation of distiller's grains.

If SFC is used in the base ration, an alternative scenario replaces SFC corn with DRC and WDGS at the two inclusion rates. Corn processing costs were adjusted, reflecting the elimination of natural gas costs with use of the dry-rolling process.

Potential costs for changes in infrastructure or equipment were accounted for to more adequately determine whether cost savings exist for feeding DRC with WDGS. Additional costs include investment in Roto-Mix® mixer/delivery box trucks, labor costs for Roto-Mix® drivers and front end loader operators, as well as fuel, insurance, and maintenance costs. The costs are correlated with the WDGS inclusion rate, where a 15% inclusion rate would require

Table 2: Scenarios for Colorado and Kansas Models, Expected Value Incorporating Ethanol By-Products.

As is feed lbs/day	Base	15% DDGS/SFC KSU	15% WDGS/SFC KSU	30% WDGS/SFC KSU	30% WDGS/SFC NE	15% WDGS/DRC	30% WDGS/DRC NE
Total Corn	**20.15**	**17.47**	**17.22**	**13.87**	**15.34**	**16.92**	**15.60**
Flaked corn	**20.15**	**17.47**	**17.22**	**13.87**	**15.19**	**0.00**	**0.00**
Dry Rolled corn	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**16.92**	**15.44**
Ground Corn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.16
Alfalfa hay	**1.41**	**1.42**	**1.40**	**1.64**	**1.31**	**1.86**	**1.38**
DDGS	**0.00**	**3.51**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**
WDGS	**0.00**	**0.00**	**8.99**	**19.22**	**18.02**	**8.99**	**18.96**
Soybean meal	0.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fat	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.02
Rumensin/Tylan	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.00
Limestone	0.41	0.64	0.64	0.32	0.30	0.00	0.32
Urea	0.30	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
KCl	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.10	0.00	0.11
Salt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.06	0.00	0.07
Vitamin/min	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.02
Premix	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.64	1.27	0.67
Premix total	0.41	0.64	0.64	1.06	1.12	1.27	1.18
Total lbs Feed/head/day	**23.24**	**23.14**	**28.35**	**35.79**	**35.80**	**29.07**	**37.13**
ADG (lbs/day)	**3.18**	**3.19**	**3.11**	**3.00**	**3.59**	**4.07**	**4.05**
DMI (lbs/day)	20.60	20.90	20.30	18.80	20.40	19.50	22.60
Adjusted DMI May	21.12	21.27	20.97	20.22	21.02	20.57	22.12
Adjusted DMI Oct	19.52	19.67	19.37	18.62	19.42	18.97	20.52
Feed:Gain (DM)	6.49	6.54	6.53	6.96	5.76	6.53	5.68

Note: DDGS: distiller's dried grains with solubles; WDGS: wet distiller's grains with solubles; SFC: steam flaked corn; ADG: average daily gain; DMI: dry matter intake; Feed: Gain is pounds of feed per pound of gain.

half the labor and fuel of the 30% WDGS inclusion rate. One Roto-Mix® truck is included in the investment costs for both the 15% and 30% WDGS scenarios. These costs were estimated based on personal communication with cattle feeders in the Texas Panhandle.

Increased feeding time and handling costs were also estimated based on the increasing amount of weight hauled to the feedlot and fed each day when incorporating WDGS. The feed cost equation estimated by Vander Pol *et al.* (2006b) was used to determine the percentage increase in feeding costs for each inclusion rate of WDGS. The percentage increase in feeding costs is calculated from the change in as-fed feed when incorporating WDGS as compared to the base ration. An industry average feeding cost of $0.085/head/day is used as the basis feeding cost.

Cattle performance was also adjusted for the DDGS and WDGS inclusion rates. The regional ADG, dry matter intake, and feed efficiency from the PCC data was adjusted by the percentage change found in feedlot nutrition studies. The feedlot nutrition studies utilized have ration components comparable to those in the model scenarios, ensuring an accurate performance adjustment.

SFC is fed in the base scenario, the 15% DDGS scenario, and the 15% WSDGS Texas Tech University (TTU) scenario for the Texas feedlot model (Table 3). DRC is fed in the 15% and 30% WDGS scenarios. The 15% WSDGS TTU ration and corresponding cattle performance are estimated from research by Galyean and Lemon (2006). The 15% and 30% WDGS rations were estimated by primarily substituting DRC for SFC in the base scenario and replacing a portion of the DRC with WDGS. Cattle performance, specifically ADG, for the 15% and 30% WDGS rations was estimated from Vander Pol *et al.* (2006a).

Nebraska ration scenarios (Table 4) were estimated from Vander Pol *et al.* (2006a,c). All Nebraska rations contain DRC, and the 30% WDGS DRC: HMC contains a combination of DRC and HMC. A DDGS scenario was not included for the Nebraska analysis, as it was assumed that all feedlots will have access to WDGS.

Results

Table 3: Scenarios for Texas Model, Expected Value.

As is feed lbs/day	0% WDGS	15% DDGS	15% WDGS	30% WDGS	15% WSDGS TTU
Total Corn	16.81	14.73	14.48	12.60	14.26
Flaked Corn	**16.81**	**14.73**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**14.26**
Dry Rolled Corn	**0.00**	**0.00**	**14.48**	**12.60**	**0.00**
HM Corn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ground Corn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Corn Silage	**2.27**	**2.27**	**2.31**	**1.73**	**0.00**
Alfalfa Hay	0.33	0.33	0.34	0.22	0.00
DDGS	**0.00**	**3.28**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**
WDGS	**0.00**	**0.00**	**8.67**	**17.31**	**8.42**
Corn Gluten Feed	**2.32**	**1.99**	**2.02**	**2.02**	**0.00**
Soybean Meal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cottonseed Hulls	0.83	0.66	0.67	0.00	1.54
Cottonseed Meal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Molasses	0.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.02
Fat (yellow grease or tallow)	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.31	0.56
Rumensin/Tylan/MGA Premix	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.56
Limestone	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.15
Urea	0.36	0.30	0.30	0.12	0.05
KCl	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.00
Salt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vitamin/premineral mix	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Premix	0.40	0.30	0.31	0.20	0.47
Premix total	1.11	0.94	0.96	0.68	1.18
Total Feed/head/day	**25.14**	**24.76**	**30.03**	**34.93**	**27.03**
ADG	**3.68**	**3.70**	**4.07**	**4.05**	**3.09**
DMI	20.09	20.10	20.82	20.75	17.25
Adj DMI May	19.87	19.87	20.23	20.20	18.45
Adj DMI Oct	18.68	18.68	19.04	19.01	17.26
Feed:Gain (dry matter basis)	4.63	4.60	4.72	4.75	5.64

Note: Cost savings = Average(Base COG-15%WDGS/DRC COG)*100 using the average of 500 iterations. COG = Cost of gain including WDGS investment costs for CO, KS, and TX. At plant costs include $0.15 corn basis

Colorado Model Results

Cost of gain is lowest for the ration scenario including 15% WDGS fed with DRC. Thirty percent WDGS/DRC was the next lowest cost of gain alternative ration.

Three model specifications should also be noted for these results. First, in this case the feedlot is located at the ethanol plant, where no transportation costs are included for WDGS. Second, the corn price basis is a positive $0.15/bu to account for the increase in corn demanded by the ethanol plant. The $0.15/bu premium for corn also increases the cost of WDGS because the WDGS is priced at 95% of the price of corn (on an equal dry matter basis).

The rations with the highest cost of gain are those where 30% WDGS is fed in a SFC based ration. These rations are based on studies from the University of Nebraska (Vander Pol *et al.*, 2006a) and Kansas State University (Daubert *et al.*, 2005). The major cost difference between the 30% WDGS/DRC and 30% WDGS/SFC scenarios is cattle performance, specifically ADG, where the total pounds gained are lower for the cattle fed WDGS/SFC than those fed WDGS/DRC-based rations. Steam-flaking costs are also much higher than dry-rolling costs, increasing the cost of gain in the WDGS/SFC rations.

When feedlots are located further from ethanol production, WDGS transportation costs are included in the cost of gain. At a distance of 25 miles from an ethanol plant, the 15% WDGS/DRC ration still has the lowest cost of gain, $0.04, but the 15% DDGS/SFC is the second lowest cost of gain scenario.

Feedlots located 300 miles from ethanol production could still lower their cost of gain by feeding 15% WDGS/DRC. The next best alternatives are 15% DDGS/SFC and the base ration scenario. The 30% WDGS/DRC ration is now clearly not preferred as a cost-minimizing scenario. Those rations combining SFC with WDGS remain the highest cost of gain alternatives.

Table 4: Scenarios for Nebraska Model.

As is feed lbs/day	CON	15% WDGS/DRC	30% WDGS/DRC	30WDGS DRC:HCM
Total Corn	**23.94**	**19.61**	**15.82**	**16.88**
Flaked Corn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dry Rolled Corn	**23.67**	**19.13**	**15.66**	**7.64**
HM Corn	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.08
Ground Corn	0.27	0.48	0.16	0.16
Corn Silage	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Alfalfa hay	**1.29**	**1.25**	**1.40**	**1.36**
DDGS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WDGS	**0.00**	**9.62**	**19.24**	**18.77**
Sweet Bran	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Soybean Meal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cottonseed Hulls	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cottonseed Meal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Molasses	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fat	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02
Rumensin/Tylan	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Limestone	0.34	0.35	0.32	0.31
Urea	0.30	0.12	0.00	0.00
KCl	0.11	0.09	0.11	0.10
Salt	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
Vitamin/min	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02
Premix	0.08	0.03	0.68	0.66
Premix total	0.79	0.58	1.09	1.06
Total Feed/head/day	**26.15**	**31.17**	**37.67**	**38.19**
ADG	**3.65**	**4.09**	**4.05**	**3.91**
DMI	24.00	24.85	22.60	21.50
Adj DMI May	23.14	23.57	22.44	21.89
Adj DMI Oct		0.12	0.11	0.07
Feed:Gain (DM)	6.52	6.08	5.68	5.61

Note: Cost savings = Average(Base COG-15%WDGS/DRC COG)*100 using the average of 500 iterations. COG = Cost of gain including WDGS investment costs for CO, KS, and TX. At plant costs include $0.15 corn basis.

The increased cost of transportation for the feedlot 300 miles from the ethanol plant when compared to the feedlot located 25 miles from an ethanol plant is approximately $0.02 and $0.05 more per pound of gain for 15% and 30% WDGS inclusion rates, respectively. The 15% WDGS/DRC ration still has the lowest cost of gain at a distance of 300 miles from ethanol production, where total WDGS transportation costs per head for the feeding period are approximately $14.73, compared with $3.58 for feedlots located 25 miles from the WDGS source. WDGS transportation costs for the 30% WDGS inclusion rates are about twice as much as those for the 15% inclusion rates, on a per head basis.

Kansas Model Results

Kansas results are similar to those from the Colorado model, with the same ration scenarios used in the analysis. The 15% WDGS/DRC, followed by the 30% WDGS/DRC were the least cost of gain ration scenarios. These results are for feedlots located at an ethanol plant, including a $0.15 corn basis and WDGS investment costs.

The results for a feedlot located 25 miles from ethanol production are nearly the same as those for the feedlot located at an ethanol plant. When WDGS must be hauled 100 miles to the feedlot, the 15% WDGS/DRC ration still had the lowest cost of gain, but the 30% WDGS/DRC scenario became less feasible.

Even when a feedlot is located 200 to 300 miles from ethanol production, the 15% WDGS ration can be fed cheapest. The 15% DDGS/SFC ration is the next least cost of gain alternative, followed by the base ration for both the 200 and 300 mile locations. Depending on the distance from ethanol production, Kansas cattle feeders can likely lower their cost of gain by incorporating WDGS or DDGS at the 15% inclusion rate (dry matter basis).

Table 5: Average Cost Savings per 100 Pounds of Gain When Feeding 15 Percent WDGS/DRC.

	Placements	At Plant	100 miles
CO	May	$5.46	$3.51
	October	$6.22	$4.43
KS	May	$6.33	$5.05
	October	$7.30	$5.93
NE	May	$4.16	$2.80
	October	$4.44	$3.08
TX	May	$2.73	$1.42
	October	$3.41	$2.24

Note: Cost savings = Average(Base COG-15%WDGS/DRC COG)*100 using the average of 500 iterations. COG = Cost of gain including WDGS investment costs for CO, KS, and TX. At plant costs include $0.15 corn basis.

Nebraska Model Results

Although only four ration scenarios are compared in the Nebraska model, the 15% WDGS/DRC ration still has the lowest cost of gain in most cases. Nebraska ration composition and corresponding cattle performance are estimated from University of Nebraska feedlot nutrition research (Vander Pol *et al.*, 2006a,c). The 15% followed by the 30% WDGS/DRC ration are the lowest cost scenarios.

At a distance of 25 miles from ethanol production, Nebraska cattle feeders can still feed 15% WDGS/DRC at the lowest cost of gain, and the 30% WDGS/DRC has a similar cost of gain to the base scenario. The increasing costs of transportation for WDGS are evident, as the 30% WDGS/DRC ration becomes less optimal when the feedlot is located 25 miles from an ethanol plant.

When transporting WDGS 60 miles, the 30% WDGS/DRC scenario is no longer preferred over the base scenario, but the 15% WDGS/DRC remains the lowest cost of gain option. The results for Nebraska feedlots located 60, 100, and 200 miles from ethanol production are similar. At each distance from ethanol production, WDGS can be fed at 15% dry matter to obtain the lowest cost of gain. The base ration of DRC has the second lowest cost of gain at all three distances.

It is important to note that cattle feeders in eastern Nebraska are feeding WDGS at inclusion rates greater than 15% of ration dry matter (Erickson, 2006). The Nebraska model could be adjusted to value WDGS at less than 95% the price of corn, and more WDGS inclusion rates could be evaluated in addition to the 15% and 30% scenarios. Changing these variables and adding scenarios could provide a more accurate estimate of the cost of gain for eastern Nebraska cattle feeders.

Texas Model Results

When located at an ethanol plant, 15% or 30% WDGS can be fed with DRC to decrease cost of gain when compared to the base, 15% DDGS/SFC, and 15% WDGS/SFC rations. It is important to note that the Texas base scenario and the 15% WSDGS TTU scenario include SFC, while the 15% and 30% WDGS rations include DRC instead of SFC. The 15% WSDGS TTU ration is based on feedlot nutrition research by Galyean and Lemon (2006) from Texas Tech University.

SFC costs more to process than DRC, due to the use of natural gas, which increases total costs for both the base and 15% WSDGS TTU scenarios. In addition, ADG for cattle fed 15% WDGS with SFC is lower than for cattle fed 15% WDGS with DRC. Even when feedlots are located at an ethanol plant, the highest cost of gain scenario occurs when WDGS is fed in SFC-based rations instead of DRC-based rations. The WDGS/SFC results are similar to those discussed previously in the Colorado and Kansas models.

When WDGS must be hauled 300 miles from an ethanol plant to a feedlot, it can still be fed at 15% of the ration dry matter. The 15% WDGS ration has a similar cost of gain as the base ration and the 15% DDGS ration. At distances greater than 100 miles from ethanol production, the 30% WDGS ration would no longer be preferred as a least cost of gain ration.

Ethanol production and the resulting co-products provide cattle feeders an alternative feed ingredient which could lower their cost of gain. When WDGS is fed with DRC at 15% of the ration dry matter, primarily replacing a portion of the DRC, cost of gain savings can range from $2.73 to $7.30 per 100 lb of gain for cattle feeders located at an ethanol plant (no WDGS transportation costs). Even when transporting WDGS 100 miles, costs per 100 lb of gain can be decreased by $1.42 to $5.93 depending on which state the feedlot is located.

Table 5 contains the cost savings from feeding 15% WDGS/DRC instead of the base ration in each state, when located at the plant and 100 miles from the ethanol plant. The cost savings are also listed by placement month because those placed on feed in May are on feed for fewer days (fewer total pounds of gain) than those placed at a lighter in-weight in

Table 6: Least Cost of Rations for Each State at Various Distances from Ethanol Production.

Nebraska May & Oct		At plant, $0.15 corn basis	25 Miles, $0.15 corn basis	60 miles	100 miles	200-300 miles
	1	15% WDGS	15% WDGS	15% WDGS	15%WDGS	15% WDGS
	2	30% WDGS	30% WDGS; Base	Base; 30% WDGS	Base	Base
Texas						
May	1	15% WDGS	15% WDGS	15% WDGS	15% WDGS	15% WDGS; 15% DDGS
	2	30% WDGS	30% WDGS	30% WDGS	Base	Base
Oct	1	15% & 30% WDGS	15% WDGS	15% WDGS	15% WDGS	15% WDGS
	2		30% WDGS	30% WDGS	30% WDGS	Base
Kansas						
May	1	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC
	2	30% WDGS/DRC	30% WDGS/DRC; 15% DDGS	15% DDGS	15% DDGS/SFC	15% DDGS
Oct	1	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC
	2	30% WDGS/DRC	30% WDGS/DRC	30% WDGS/DRC ; 15% DDGS	30% WDGS/DRC; 15% DDGS; Base	15% DDGS
Colorado						
May	1	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC
	2	30% WDGS/DRC	15% DDGS/SFC	15% DDGS	15% DDGS/SFC	15% DDGS
Oct	1	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC	15% WDGS/DRC
	2	30% WDGS/DRC	30% WDGS/DRC; Base; 15% DDGS	Base; 15% DDGS	15% DDGS; Base	15% DDGS; Base

Note: WDGS is fed with DRC in all above scenarios and DDGS is fed with SFC.

October. Generally, cost savings per pound of gain are greater for the October placements as a result of more days on feed and more total pounds of gain per head.

The least cost and second least cost alternatives for each state and placement date are included in Table 6. The least-cost scenarios for each distance from ethanol production are included to show the impact of increasing transportation costs for WDGS, as it contains only 35% dry matter. The 15% WDGS/DRC ration is preferred in all cases. Again, the major difference between the 15% WDGS/DRC ration and the 15% WDGS/SFC rations is the higher ADG when cattle are fed WDGS with DRC. The cost savings from dry-rolling corn instead of using natural gas to steam-flake corn is another significant cost saving aspect of the 15% WDGS/DRC scenario.

The next best alternative is either the 30% WDGS/DRC ration or the 15% DDGS/SFC ration, in most cases. If feedlots are located within 200 to 300 miles of ethanol production and WDGS is priced at 95% the price of corn (on an equal dry matter basis), the co-product is a cost-saving feed ingredient. Feedlot nutrition research has also shown that WDGS improves cattle performance when fed with DRC, so it has benefits on both the cost saving and total gain sides of the cost of gain equation.

Summary and Conclusions

The 15% WDGS/DRC ration consistently had the lowest cost of gain when compared to the other scenarios when feedlots were located within 200 miles of ethanol production. On the other hand, the 15% and 30% WDGS/SFC rations consistently had the highest costs of gain, even when feedlots were located at the ethanol plant. The primary difference between these ration scenarios is the lower ADG when cattle are fed WDGS with SFC instead of DRC. The increased cost of corn processing when steam-flaking corn also results in higher costs for the WDGS/SFC rations. It is important to note the differences in ADG for each ration. The current feeding infrastructure in areas further from the Corn Belt is a disadvantage. SFC is a more costly investment that has al-

ready been made. The benefits of feeding distiller's grains are largely lost if SFC feeding continues. The areas feeding SFC also rail in the corn. While the rail infrastructure is in place, any impacts of substituting loads of distiller's grains for corn are not explored in this work. However, transportation costs will be an important issue in the regional economics of cattle feeding.

WDGS and DDGS can improve cattle performance and, through increased ADG, decrease the total cost of gain. The partial budget model shows that these co-products will help offset the higher corn prices, as co-products can be fed at a lower cost of gain than the base ration, even for feedlots located 200 to 300 miles from ethanol production. The gain in cattle performance is critical to the success of these rations.

This research relies on limited animal science feedlot nutrition studies regarding the use of ethanol co-products in feedlot rations. As seen in the analysis, cattle performance differences can make the difference between alternative scenarios including WDGS as the least and the highest cost rations. More feeding research and practical application and experience may change the current base of knowledge.

References

Agricultural Marketing Service. *Grain Transportation Report*. "2006 Reports." Washington, DC: US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, 2006. [Accessed June 2006.] Available from http://www.ams.usda.gov/tmdtsb/grain/GTR2006.htm

Albright, M.L., T.C. Schroeder and M.R. Langemeier. "Determinants of Cattle Feeding Cost-of-Gain Variability." *Journal of Production Agriculture* 7(2) (1994): 206-210.

Cole, N. A., M.L. Galyean, J. Drouillard, L.W. Greene, F.T. McCollum, P.J. Defoor and C.R. Richardson. "Recent Research with Distiller's Grains and Corn Milling Byproducts - Southern Plains." Presented paper, Plains Nutrition Council Spring Conference, San Antonio, TX, April 6-7, 2006.

Cooper, Rob, Todd Milton, Terry Klopfenstein and Dick Clark. "Economic Evaluation of Corn Processing for Finishing Cattle." *2001 Nebraska Beef Report*. MP 76-A. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension, January 2001. [Accessed March 19, 2008.] Available from http://beef.unl.edu/beefreports/200119.shtml

Daubert, R.W., J.S. Drouillard, E.R. Loe, J.J. Sindt, B.E. Depenbusch, J.T. Fox, M.A. Greenquist and M.E. Corrigan. "Optimizing Use of Wet Sorghum Distiller's Grains with Solubles in Flaked-corn Finishing Diets." *Beef Cattle Research-2005*. Report of Progress 943. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service, 2005. [Accessed March 19, 2008.] Available from http://www.asi.k-state.edu/DesktopModules/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentID=2501

Drouillard, J., B.E. Depenbusch, E.R. Loe, A.S. Webb, M.E. Corrigan and M.J. Quinn. "Wet vs. Dry Distiller's Grains in Finishing Diets." Presented paper, Plains Nutrition Council Spring Conference, San Antonio, TX, April 6-7, 2006.

Energy Information Administration. *State and U.S. Historical Data*. Washington, DC: US Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration, 2006. [Accessed April 2006.] Available from http://www.eia.doe.gov/overview_hd.html

Erickson, G. "Feedlot Economics of Feeding By-Products to Cattle." *The Ethanol Industry in Nebraska: Relevant Research Results from IANR*. Omaha, NE: Briefing to Members of the Unicameral, February 8, 2005.

Erickson, G.E. Personal communication. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE, March 30, 2006.

Galyean, M.L. and K. Lemon. 2006. "Concentration of Distiller's Grains in Finishing Diets: Animal Performance." Presented paper, Plains Nutrition Council Spring Conference, San Antonio, TX, April 6-7, 2006.

Ham, G.A., R.A. Stock, T.J. Klopfenstein, E.M. Larson, D.H. Shain and R.P. Huffman. 1994. "Wet Corn Distiller's Byproducts Compared with Dried Corn Distiller's Grains with Solubles as a Source of Protein and Energy for Ruminants." *Journal of Animal Science* 72(12)(December 1994): 3246-3257. [Accessed March 19, 2008.] Available from http://jas.fass.org/cgi/reprint/72/12/3246?maxtoshow=&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&title=Wet+Corn+Distiller%92s+Byproducts+Compared+with+Dried+Corn+Distiller%92s+Grains+with&andorexacttitle=and&andorexacttitleabs=and&andorexactfulltext=and&searchid=1&FIRSTINDEX=0&sortspec=relevance&resourcetype=HWCIT

Haugen, R. H., H.G. Hughes. "Economic Evaluation of Wet Corn Gluten Feed in Beef Feedlot Finishing." Fargo, ND: North Dakota State University, unpublished research, 1997.

Kissinger, W.F., R.E. Massey, R.K. Koelsch, G.E. Erickson. "Economics of Manure Phosphorus Distribution from Beef Feeding Operations." Presented paper, American Society of Agriculutral and Biological Engineers Annual International Meeting, Portland, OR, July 9-12, 2006.

Klopfenstein, T. J. 2001. "Distiller's Grains for Beef Cattle." Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska, unpublished research, 2001.

Larson, E.M., R.A. Stock, T.J. Klopfenstein, M.H. Sindt and R.P. Huffman. "Feeding Value of Wet Distiller's Byproducts for Finishing Ruminants." *Journal of Animal Science* 71(8)(August 1993): 2228-2236. [Accessed March 19, 2008.] Available from http://jas.fass.org/cgi/reprint/71/8/2228?maxtoshow=&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&author1=Larson&andorexactfulltext=and&searchid=1&FIRSTINDEX=20&sortspec=relevance&resourcetype=HWCIT

Lodge, S.L., R.A. Stock, T.J. Klopfenstein, D.H. Sahin and D.W. Herold. "Evaluation of Corn and Sorghum Distiller's Byproducts." *Journal of Animal Science* 75(1)(January 1997): 37-43. [Accessed March 19, 2008.] Available from http://jas.fass.org/cgi/reprint/75/1/37?maxtoshow=&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&author1=lodge&andorexactfulltext=and&searchid=1&FIRSTINDEX=0&sortspec=relevance&resourcetype=HWCIT

Macken, C.N., G.E. Erickson and T.J. Klopfenstein. "The Cost of Corn Processing for Finishing Cattle." *Professional Animal Scientist* 22(1)(February 2006): 23-32.

Mark, Darrell R., Ted C. Schroeder and Rodney Jones. "Economic Risk in Cattle Feeding." *Journal of Agribusiness* 18(3)(Fall 2000): 331-344. [Accessed March 19, 2008.] Available from http://www.agecon.uga.edu/~jab/Library/F00-08.pdf

Markham, S. "Distillers Dried Grains and Their Impact on Corn, Soymeal and Livestock Markets." Presented paper, Agricultural Outlook Forum, Arlingon, VA, February 24-25, 2005.

Perrin, R., T. Klopfenstein. "Economic Returns of Wet Byproducts as Cattle Feed." *2001 Nebraska Beef Report*. MP 76-A. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension, January 2001. [Accessed March 19, 2008.] Available from http://beef.unl.edu/beefreports/200119.shtml

Richardson, James W. *Simulation for Applied Risk Management with Simetar Simulation for Excel© To Analyze Risk©*. College Station, TX: Department of Agricultural Economics, January 2005.

Schroeder, J.W. *Distiller's Grains as a Protein and Energy Supplement for Dairy Cattle*. As-1241. Fargo, ND: North Dakota State University Extension Service, February 2003. [Accessed March 19, 2008.] Available from http://www.ext.nodak.edu/extpubs/ansci/dairy/as1241.pdf

Shurson, J. and S. Noll. "Feed and Alternative Uses for DDGS." Presented paper, Energy from Agriculture Conference, St. Louis, MO, December 14-15, 2005.

US Meat Export Federation. *Library*. Denver, CO: U.S. Meat Export Federation, 2006. [Accessed May 2006.] Available from http://www.usmef.org/TradeLibrary/

Vander Pol, K.J., G.E. Erickson, M.A. Greenquist, T.J. Klopfenstein and T. Robb. "Effect of Corn Processing in Finishing Diets Containing Wet Distillers Grains on Feedlot Performance and Carcass Characteristics of Finishing Steers." *2006 Beef Cattle Report*. MP 88-A. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension, January 2006a. [Accessed March 19, 2008.] Available from http://www.ianrpubs.unl.edu/epublic/live/mp100/build/mp88.pdf

Vander Pol, K.J., G.E. Erickson, T.J. Klopfenstein and D.R. Mark. "Economic Optimum Use of Wet Distillers Grains in Feedlots." *2006 Beef Cattle Report*. MP 88-A. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension, January 2006b. [Accessed March 19, 2008.] Available from http://www.ianrpubs.unl.edu/epublic/live/mp100/build/mp88.pdf

Vander Pol, K.J., G.E. Erickson, T.J. Klopfenstein, M.A. Greenquist and T. Robb. "Effect of Dietary Inclusion of Wet Distillers Grains on Feedlot Performance of Finishing Cattle and Energy Value Relative to Corn." *2006 Beef Cattle Report*. MP 88-A. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension, January 2006c. [Accessed March 19, 2008.] Available from http://www.ianrpubs.unl.edu/epublic/live/mp100/build/mp88.pdf