

October 2022

U.P. Ag Connections Newsletter

Agricultural News from MSU Extension and AgBioResearch

Volume 26 Issue 10

In this issue:

Page 2-3

Start planning your nutrient needs now

Page 3

Conservation Technician needed in the Sault

Page 4

Integrated pest management progress

USDA Farmland Cash Rental Rates

Page 5

Herbicide resistance testing

Page 6

Advertisers

Page 7

Advertisers

Classifieds

Page 8

Market Report

Fall Feeder Cattle Sale

Three constitutional amendments on the ballot for Michigan voters this November

When Michigan voters head to the polls, whether on election day or at their dining room table (for those who vote absentee) there will be a lot on the ballot. In addition to selecting the state's next Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, and <u>other elected officials</u>, they'll be asked to vote on three ballot questions, each proposing to amend the state constitution.

<u>Proposal 22-1</u>, sent to the ballot by a 2/3 majority vote in the state legislature, would change (but not eliminate) term limits in Michigan, and require the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, and state legislators to file annual financial disclosure reports.

<u>Proposal 22-2</u>, on the ballot through a signature gathering petition, would add several voting rights to the Michigan constitution.

<u>Proposal 22-3</u>, on the ballot through a signature gathering petition, would establish a new right to reproductive freedom for all matters related to pregnancy, including access to abortion prior to fetal viability.

Michigan residents can learn more about these three proposals and their possible impacts through a virtual forum on October 19. This forum will feature presentations from experts on each of the three proposals, and a chance for voters to ask questions to help inform their votes this November.

The webinars will take place on Zoom and Facebook live: October 19, 12:00 PM

More information and registration for the webinar is available at: <u>https://events.anr.msu.edu/</u> <u>ballot22/</u>.

<u>Michigan State University Extension</u> has also prepared summaries of each ballot proposal. These written summaries provide comparisons to current Michigan law, similar laws in other states, and possible impacts of the three proposals. Readers can access those summaries at the links below:

Proposal 22-1: Financial Disclosure Reports & Legislative Term Limits

Michigan State University

AgBio**Research** MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY Extension

Proposal 22-2: Promote the Vote 2022

Proposal 22-3: Reproductive Freedom for All

All information here can be found on the MSU website: canr.msu.edu and search for Michigan ballot proposal summaries

Start planning your nutrient needs now

By Sarah Fronczak and Jonathan LaPorte, Michigan State University Extension

As fall season approaches, producers across all farms are beginning to look at 2023's profit potential. One key ingredient to a profitable year is how much your farm's nutrient management needs will cost. While fertilizer supplies are expected to be better next season, prices are not expected to fall dramatically. Local availability may also remain a concern as retailers continue working through supply chain disruptions. Despite these types of uncertainties, farms can position themselves to minimize fertilizer costs and retain farm profits.

Know expected prices of key input purchases

Remember an important trend about prices. When commodity market prices are trending upwards, input prices tend to follow quickly. A higher demand for a product often brings with it an equally higher demand for inputs needed to produce it. However, when commodity prices decline, input prices are not as quick to follow. The lag time of fertilizer prices to follow markets impacts all farms, regardless of whether you raise field crops, forages, fruits, or vegetables.

Minimizing costs starts with understanding expected prices. A conversation with local retailers about current prices is needed before you can identify options to minimize costs. Once identified, you need to analyze which options are best for your farm.

Analyze best options for your farm

Knowing what options are available is one part of minimizing costs. The key is deciding which options will work best for your farm's current situation.

- To find which options are best for your farm, start with your soil. Soil sampling is critically important to reducing fertilizer costs. You need to know what you have to work with before considering any other decisions.
- As you think about yield goals, consider how reasonable those goals are to meet. Are they based on historical trends? Unfounded wishes? It is always best to focus on a goal that is within your farm's potential. Remember, you are basing your cost planning on what yield you want to achieve.
- Pricing strategies may favor purchasing only a portion of your nutrient needs this fall. With a portion bought, you have secured access to some nutrients and a starting point to gauge future price changes.
- Consider manure or compost as a possible nutrient source. These sources can provide nutrients in this crop year as well as years to come. In addition to nutrients, they can also provide organic matter that creates healthier soil.

Compare fertilizer prices to all other input needs and account for all options to reduce cost of production. Those options can include changes in planting intentions, renting out less productive acres, or adopting new practices to reduce fuel or chemical usage.

Consider nutrient retention and harvesting

Cover crops can be an effective way of preventing nutrient loss through erosion. When nutrients are applied to the soil surface, whether as manure or granular, nutrients can be lost during rainstorms, snow melt, and winter winds. Actively growing roots hold soil in place, while above ground plant growth shields soil from movement caused by wind and water.

Cover crops can contribute nitrogen to cash crops by converting atmospheric nitrogen to soil nitrogen and by scavenging and mining soil nutrients. Crops grown in fields after legumes can take up at least 30 - 60 % of the N that the legume produced. You can learn more about cover crops in <u>Managing Cover Crops Profitably</u> published by SARE.

Cover crops can tighten nutrient cycling in your field by taking up nutrients that might otherwise leach out of the field. Nonlegume cover crops are the best at nitrate conservation due to deep roots that form quickly after planted. For much of Michigan cereal rye is the best choice for capturing nutrients after a summer crop. Research has shown that rye planted in the fall by Oct. 1 can take up more than 70 lbs of nitrogen per acre. Nitrogen in rye can be returned to your next crop when rye is terminated in spring. Finally, Cover crops can contribute to phosphorus availability through housing beneficial mycorrhizae that are efficient at absorbing phosphorus from the soil and passing it on to their plant host. Keeping phosphorus in an organic form is the best way to maintain availability for your crop.

Use available tools to aid decision-making

Finally, weigh through options using available decision tools from MSU Extension. The series of *Fertilizer Cost Comparison Decision Tools* are specifically designed to help you review nutrient management plans and their costs. These tools do not replace soil testing or soil-based recommendations. Instead, they offer an opportunity to consider how to meet nutrient needs at the lowest possible cost.

There are four versions of the decision tool available:

<u>Field Crops</u> – Nutrient planning for corn, soybeans, and wheat growers <u>Forages</u> – Nutrient planning for alfalfa, grass, and alfalfa/grass mix growers <u>Fruit</u> – Nutrient planning for fruit growers <u>Vegetables</u> – Nutrient planning for vegetable growers

The <u>Fertilizer Cost Comparison Decision Tools</u> can be accessed through the MSU Extension's <u>Farm Management</u> website on the <u>Decision Tools subpage</u>. For more information or feedback on future improvements to these decision tools, please contact Jon LaPorte at <u>laportej@msu.edu</u>.



The Chippewa Luce Mackinac Conservation District is hiring for a Conservation Technician Position that will be responsible for implementing the Michigan Agriculture Environmental Assurance Program (MAEAP) at CLMCD.

Position Description:

The Chippewa Luce Mackinac Conservation District (CLMCD) is seeking interested applicants to serve as a Conservation Technician in the area of agriculture/environmental stewardship. The Conservation Technician will be responsible for implementing the Michigan Agriculture Environmental Assurance Program (MAEAP) in all of Chippewa, Luce, and Mackinac counties. The purpose of the MAEAP program is to provide private landowners with on-farm technical assistance. This includes conducting farm-specific risk assessments; coordinating local, state, and federal agency resources to help farmers reduce environmental risks, and assisting farmers in making progress toward environmental verification through MAEAP. The Technician is also responsible for collaborating with other District staff/partners to promote MAEAP and educate diverse audiences on the importance of environmental quality in the Eastern Upper Peninsula. The selected candidate will be based in Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan and will include assignments in all of Chippewa, Luce, and Mackinac counties.

How to Apply:

Serious applicants should submit a professional resume, cover letter, and a list of three (3) references to <u>clmcd@macd.org</u> with the subject: MAEAP Position or mail to CLMCD C/O Mike McCarthy, 2847 Ashmun St, Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783 for consideration. Application materials are due by October 21st, 2022 by 4:00pm or until position is filled, preference will be given to applications received by that date.

https://www.clmcd.org/jobs

Podcast celebrates 50 years of integrated pest management progress

By Erin Lizotte, MSUE

In 1972, the first large scale IPM (integrated pest management) research project was launched to address growing concerns related to the negative impacts of widespread pesticide use. This research project pulled together the concepts of dozens of cross-disciplinary studies that formed the basis of IPM and included the identification and role of natural enemies in agriculture systems and pest modeling to better assess crop risk and identify treatment opportunities. Entomologists led the initial IPM charge, helping create legislation (Senate Bill 1794) to fund research in this innovative arena.

This critical federal funding supported two major research projects, the Huffaker Project and the Consortium. By the mid-80s, these projects led to the adoption of IPM practices on over 14 million acres of agricultural land and increased farmer net profits by an estimated \$578 million annually. The 80s and 90s saw continued progress in IPM research and development with the generation of hundreds of decision-making tools and IPM tactics that improved the environmental and economic sustainability of farms.

During the 90s, several critical IPM infrastructure resources were developed, including pest diagnostic technology, weatherbased modeling systems and an increased number of dedicated research and outreach faculty working to expand IPM adoption on farms. These resources have continued to improve in the 21st century as technology and accessibility expands.

The future of IPM is hopeful despite many challenges including climate change, invasive pests and pesticide resistance. IPM also faces substantial challenges in educating the public about the true costs and benefits of adopting or not adopting available pest management technologies. As our understanding of the natural world and agricultural systems improve, so will our ability to develop IPM strategies that produce safe, healthy and environmentally responsible food.

To learn more about the history and future of IPM in our north-central region, check out the special <u>50th Anniversary of IPM</u> <u>episode series</u> on the <u>IPM Central Podcast</u>. This podcast is available on most major podcast platforms as well as <u>Michigan</u> <u>State University Extension</u>'s <u>Integrated Pest Management website</u>.

USDA Farm Land Cash Rental Information 2022-2011 https://www.canr.msu.edu/farm_management/										
		The followi	ng information	has be compile	ed from the US	DA-NASS Quick	stats web page	2.		
11	This represents the suggested average farm land cash rental rates received by landowners in each county as reported to USDA.								2014	
County	2022 \$/Acre	2021 \$/Acre	2020 \$/Acre	2019 \$/Acre	2017 \$/Acre	2016 \$/Acre	2014 \$/Acre	2013 \$/Acre	2012 \$/Acre	2011 \$/Acre
RENT, CASH, CROPLAN	ID, NON-IRRIG	ATED		*///		47.16.6				
ALCONA	\$30.00	\$19.50	\$23.50	\$29.50	\$21.00	\$24.00	\$19.50	\$17.00	\$23.00	\$25.00
ALGER	\$20.00	\$16.00								
ALLEGAN	\$146.00	\$129.00	\$132.00	\$137.00	\$126.00	\$130.00	\$125.00	\$120.00	\$140.00	\$104.00
ALPENA	\$33.00	\$37.00	\$32.50	\$31.00	\$32.50	\$32.50	\$31.00	\$24.00	\$27.50	\$28.00
ANTRIM		\$28.00		\$27.50	\$45.00	\$50.00	\$22.00	\$23.00	\$26.50	\$20.50
ARENAC	\$96.00	\$87.00	\$89.00	\$83.00			\$85.00	\$87.50	\$88.50	\$61.00
BARRY	\$115.00	\$102.00	\$107.00		\$106.00	\$109.00	\$110.00	\$90.50	\$86.50	\$87.00
BAY	\$151.00	\$134.00	\$138.00	\$136.00	\$132.00		\$132.00	\$116.00	\$117.00	\$99.00
BERRIEN	\$131.00	\$122.00	\$123.00	\$116.00	\$115.00	\$128.00	\$133.00	\$110.00	\$84.50	\$85.00
BRANCH	\$125.00	\$131.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$115.00	\$130.00	\$110.00	\$91.00	\$102.00	\$93.00
CALHOUN	\$127.00	\$121.00	\$113.00	\$121.00	\$105.00	\$105.00	\$110.00	\$112.00	\$89.00	\$89.00
CASS	\$129.00	\$123.00	\$117.00	\$118.00	\$113.00	\$115.00	\$109.00	\$115.00	\$106.00	\$95.00
CHARLEVOIX	\$31.50	\$24.50			\$30.00	\$36.00	\$37.00	\$20.50	\$20.00	\$20.50
CHEBOYGAN	\$29.00	\$30.00	\$20.00	\$22.50	\$23.50	\$28.50	\$25.00	\$26.00	\$27.00	\$18.00
CHIPPEWA	\$15.00	\$20.50	\$19.50	\$15.00	\$17.00	\$18.00	\$18.00	\$24.00	\$14.00	\$15.00
CLARE	\$58.50	\$68.50	\$59.50		\$61.00	\$60.00	\$56.00	\$58.50	\$38.00	\$38.00
CLINTON	\$161.00	\$146.00	\$151.00	\$144.00	\$145.00	\$139.00	\$131.00	\$116.00	\$122.00	\$109.00
DELTA	\$20.00	\$23.50	\$22.50	\$21.50	\$26.50	\$26.00	\$28.00	\$24.00	\$24.00	\$25.00
EATON	\$136.00	\$120.00	\$119.00	\$130.00	\$120.00	\$132.00	\$104.00	\$100.00	\$103.00	\$82.00
EMMET		\$30.00	\$26.00	\$28.00	\$30.00	\$40.00	\$20.50		\$19.00	\$19.50
GENESEE	\$92.00	\$98.50	\$89.00	\$88.00	\$90.00	\$90.00	\$78.00	\$79.00	\$69.50	\$60.50
GLADWIN	\$61.50	\$79.00	\$90.00	\$103.00	\$100.00	\$105.00	\$105.00	\$86.00	\$61.50	\$40.00
GRAND TRAVERSE	\$54.00	\$51.00	\$37.00	\$40.00	\$42.50	\$42.00	\$35.00	\$37.50	\$32.50	\$31.50
GRATIOT	\$178.00	\$162.00	\$148.00		\$145.00	\$141.00	\$130.00	\$131.00	\$131.00	\$105.00
HILLSDALE	\$138.00	\$120.00	\$123.00	\$125.00	\$120.00	\$136.00	\$141.00	\$109.00	\$105.00	\$92.00
HURON	\$231.00	\$215.00	\$206.00	\$205.00	\$196.00	\$214.00	\$188.00	\$176.00	\$176.00	\$145.00
INGHAM	\$138.00	\$136.00	\$133.00	\$130.00	\$110.00	\$115.00	\$103.00	\$104.00	\$76.00	\$72.00
IUNIA	\$172.00	\$162.00	\$147.00	\$146.00	\$147.00	\$141.00	\$130.00	\$131.00	\$127.00	\$97.50
IUSCO	\$47.50	\$46.50	\$44.50	\$36.50	\$33.00	\$36.00	\$29.50	\$29.00	\$27.50	\$23.00
ISABELLA	\$101.00	\$112.00	\$102.00	\$107.00	\$97.00	\$100.00	\$85.50	\$86.50	\$63.00	\$63.00
JACKSUN	\$111.00	\$101.00	\$91.50	\$88.50	\$80.00	\$86.00	\$86.00	\$78.00	\$78.50	\$71.00
KALAMAZOU	\$128.00	\$113.00	\$115.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$100.00	\$94.50	\$103.00	\$94.50	\$84.00
LAKE	\$120.00	\$122.00	\$115.00	\$121.00	\$114.00	\$115.00	\$127.00	\$128.00	\$95.00	390.00
LARE	¢08.50	\$45.00	¢79.00	¢70.00	\$70.00	\$77.00	\$76.00	\$67.50	¢62.00	¢62.00
LEELANALL	\$70.50	\$59.50	\$78.00	\$75.00	\$15.00	\$52.00	\$55.00	\$61.50	\$55.50	\$41.00
LENIAWEE	\$159.00	\$149.00	\$129.00	\$128.00	\$129.00	\$151.00	\$166.00	\$152.00	\$146.00	\$125.00
LIVINGSTON	\$86.50	\$81.50	\$75.00	\$70.00	\$125.00	\$151.00	\$100.00	\$73.50	\$69.00	\$58.00
MACOMB	\$92.00	\$79.50	\$74.00	\$75.00		\$68.00	\$69.00	\$65.00	\$65.00	\$55.00
MANISTEE	\$30.50	\$28.00	\$31.00	\$31.50	\$33.50	\$28.00	\$29.00	203.00	\$24.00	\$22.00
MASON	\$61.50	\$64.50	\$48.00	\$48.00	233.50	920.00	\$58.50	\$55.00	\$50.50	\$44.00
MECOSTA	\$56.00	\$66.00	\$70.00	\$68.00	\$70.00	\$65.00	\$47.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$35.00
MENOMINEE	\$32.00	\$33.00	\$26.00	\$26.00	\$27.50	\$22.00	\$24.00	\$24.50	\$17.50	\$17.50
MIDLAND	\$142.00	\$133.00	\$133.00	\$131.00	\$120.00	\$125.00	\$105.00	\$129.00	\$94.00	\$85.00
MISSAUKEE	\$87.50	\$84.00	\$79.50	\$81.00	\$77.00	\$62.00	\$59.00	\$60.00	\$61.00	\$52.00
MONROE	\$149.00	\$151.00	\$131.00	\$131.00	\$140.00	\$142.00	\$132.00	\$125.00	\$130.00	\$130.00
MONTCALM	\$93.50	\$89.00	\$81.00	\$82.00	\$82.00	\$83.00	\$83.00	\$84.50	\$64.50	\$56.00
MONTMORENCY	\$40.50	\$55.50	\$41.50							
MUSKEGON	\$90.00	\$77.00	\$88.00	\$88.00	\$89.00	\$98.00			\$74.00	\$62.00
NEWAYGO	\$81.50	\$68.00	\$72.50	\$76.00	\$70.00	\$58.00	\$66.00	\$67.00		

USDA Farmland Cash Rental Rates

The "USDA Farmland Cash Rental Rates" document is a listing of the county rental rates dating from 2011 to the 2022 year. The information was obtained from the USDA's National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) and is based on their survey results from producers.

It is important to remember that land rent prices vary tremendously from county to county. In Michigan, the higher productivity soils tend to command a higher price. This includes tile drained or irrigated areas where specialty crops are grown, such as sugar beets and vegetables.

Other factors can impact the price that farmers are willing and able to pay for land rent. Some of these factors can include field size, access, soil type, soil fertility, previous cropping history, and proximity to their farm operation.

Looking at this report will give you a place to start, but may not reflect the true value of the farmland. To assist in determining what a reasonable rate is for your production area, please see the MSU Extension factsheet ""<u>Farmland Rent</u> <u>Considerations.</u>"

2022 status of herbicide-resistant weeds in Michigan

Erin Hill and Eric Patterson, Michigan State University, Department of Plant, Soil and Microbial Sciences

In 2021, Michigan State University Plant & Pest Diagnostics (PPD) received 75 samples for herbicide resistance screening. The majority of these samples (61) were submitted during the summer months as part of a molecular testing pilot program sponsored by the Michigan Soybean Committee (MSC) under the direction of Eric Patterson and Erin Hill, as well as M.S. student Juliano Sulzback. The goal of this program is to develop new molecular assays for detecting resistance to glyphosate and/or acetolactate synthase (ALS) inhibiting herbicides on some of Michigan's most economically important weeds so that it may become a service offered by PPD. Thanks to the submissions from a few perennial PPD clients, the following weeds were investigated: Palmer amaranth, waterhemp, common ragweed, giant ragweed, and marestail/horseweed.

The processes of sample handling, DNA extraction, and DNA amplification presented some learning curves; 39 of the samples were successfully screened and we identified a novel mutation, not yet reported in marestail/horseweed for ALS herbicide resistance. The other 22 tissue samples had insufficient DNA as a result of degradation. These issues are being resolved in 2022 by expediting delivery or drop off of samples. We worked diligently throughout the fall and into the spring and summer months of 2022 to redesign some primers needed to amplify DNA regions of interest. Previously published primers did not always work for Michigan biotypes of particular weed species. We are continuing to streamline this process with the expectation that this service will be offered publicly in the future.

The remaining 14 samples submitted in 2021 were screened for herbicide resistance using traditional bioassays in the greenhouse. Traditional bioassays involve growing weeds from seed and spraying them under controlled conditions. This process is time consuming, however traditional bioassays offer comprehensive results and are not limited to what is currently understood regarding the mechanisms of resistance. Eight of these 14 samples were from Michigan and five from out of state. All but two of the Michigan samples were sponsored by the MSC or the Michigan Vegetable Council (MVC) in partnership with Sushila Chaudhari. The MSC covers screening for select weed species growing in soybean rotations (i.e., pigweeds, ragweeds, marestail/horseweed, and common lambsquarters) and the MVC covers any suspected resistant weed found in vegetable rotations.

Of the seven Michigan samples, six were confirmed to be resistant to various herbicides. Three of these cases had not previously been confirmed in the counties in which they were sampled. ALS inhibitor resistance (G#2) in redroot pigweed was documented for the first time in Gratiot County and resistance to glyphosate + ALS inhibiting herbicides (G# 9 + 2) in waterhemp was confirmed in Allegan County. Finally, in large crabgrass, acetyl coA carboxylase (ACCase, i.e. graminicide, G#1) resistance was confirmed for the first time in Oceana County, making it the second Michigan county to have a confirmed case.

Two new species were screened in 2021 and found to be resistant. The native species six-weeks fescue (Festuca octoflora) is not a common weed in field crops; however, struggles with control were noted in a rotation in Hillsdale county. This population was confirmed to be resistant to glyphosate. The second novel case noted in 2021 was discovered by accident. Seed from a St. Joseph county population of johnsongrass (Sorghum halapense) was collected, with the help of MSU Extension educator Lyndon Kelley, for comparison to two out of state samples. The expectation was that this Michigan sample would be susceptible to the modes of action being screened, however ALS resistance was confirmed. Fortunately, one of the out of state sample proved to be susceptible to the modes of action screened.

Herbicide resistance testing via bioassays will again be available in the fall of 2022. Fully mature seeds are needed for these screens, with most annual species expected to have mature seeds starting in mid-September through frost. All submissions are due by mid-November 2022. Information on these supported programs, fees for other types of samples, and the submission process can be found on the MSU PPD website or in the back of the 2022 Weed Control Guide for Field Crops (E-434). Information and photos showing how to collect seeds for the bioassays is available in "Tips for collecting weed seeds: Ensure your resistance sample gets tested." If you have any questions regarding the 2021 results or future sample submissions, please contact Erin Hill (hiller12@msu.edu) for more information.







Michigan State University Upper Peninsula Research and Extension Center P.O. Box 168, E3774 University Drive Chatham, MI 49816 NON-PROFIT ORG U.S. POSTAGE PAID PERMIT #77 SAULT STE MARIE, MI 49783

AgBioResearch <u>MICHIGAN STATE</u> UNIVERSITY

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

Serving the Upper Peninsula Agricultural Industry

Michigan State University Extension is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity employer. Michigan State University programs and materials are open to all without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, gender identity, religion, age, height, weight, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, marital status, family status, or veteran status.

U.P. Ag Connections appreciates the support of this newsletter by our advertisers, however in no way does this imply endorsement of any specific products or services.

If you do not wish to receive this publication, please contact Michelle at colema98@msu.edu or (906) 439-5114

Gaylord, MI - 1-76 (exit 282), 2 miles West on M-32 to N. Town line Road: Go 2 miles north to sale yard

2022 FALL FEEDER CATTLE SALES
Note: All Sales on Friday at 12:00

October 14	October 28
November 11	December 9
Pre-conditioned Cattle will be sold fi	rst—proof required

PRECONDITIONING PROGRAM STRONGLY RECOMMENDED

- ALL FEDERS MUST MEET PROPER TB & ID REQUIREMENTS
- REQUEST CATTLE BE BROUGHT IN THE DAY BEFORE THE SALE
- BRED CATTLE & BREEDING BULLS MAY BE SOLD AT SALES
- STEERS IN QUESTION WILL BE SOLD AS BULLS

•

Sale Barn TELEPHONE# 989-732-5732

FRANK or JAN LEIST - TELEPHONE# 231-439-5679 See us on our website: www.northernmichiganlivestock.com

Market Report							
Choice Steers	\$130-\$145 per 100 lbs.						
Holstein Steers	\$110-\$138 per 100 lbs.						
Hogs	\$55-\$65 per 100 lbs.						
Lambs	\$100-\$150 per 100 lbs.						
Cull cows	\$70-\$80 per 100 lbs.						
Calves	\$100-\$150 per 100 lbs.						
Goats	\$200-\$350 per 100 lbs.						
Breeding and Feeder Animals							
Grade Holstein cows top \$1800/head							
Grade Holstein bred heife	rs top \$1750/head						
Feed Prices across the U.F	<u>.</u>						
Avg. \$/cwt	Avg. \$/ton Price Range						
Corn \$17.93	\$358.65 \$265-560						

Com	ŞT1.92	2220.02	Ş205-50U			
Soymeal	\$30.25	\$605.00	\$525-690			
Oats	\$17.58	\$351.50	\$310-416			
Barley	\$13.83	\$276.50	\$200-386			
Average price/100 wt. for 1 ton lots						