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Case studies

- NYS dairy farms
- Organic*, conventional, different sizes
- Conducted in January 2017 and January 2018
- Overall, relatively consistent responses
- Some variation in experience based on size and location of the farm
- Conducted by: Jennifer Ifft PhD, Rob Lynch DVM, and Kelsey O'Shea

*Organic farm case study collected as a baseline, as they are not eligible to utilize in feed antibiotics.
Overview of findings: potential cost concerns

• Given the limitation put on in feed antibiotics, most farms cited that their next strategy to mitigate illness was:
  • Newer or upgrading facilities at a considerable cost
  • Increased labor
  • Other medications
  • Updated protocols
Overview of findings: increased paperwork

• Most farms indicted that:
  • To be compliant, they had to increase the amount of time they spent on paperwork for protocols
  • They were also paying their vet more to complete some of the required paperwork
Overview of findings: additional vet fees

• Due to the increases in paperwork required by both the VFD and VCPR most farms indicated:
  • Vets were spending more time at the farm exploring other management/treatment options
  • Vets were completing or aiding in new protocols to eliminate the usage of in feed antibiotics
  • Concern regarding the increase in insurance cost for vets to back VCPR's and be liable for the repercussions of in feed antibiotics prescribed
Overview of findings: availability of antibiotics

• This issue was described primarily by larger dairy operations (i.e. those over 1,000 lactating and dry animals):
  • When in feed antibiotics were needed, most feed mills were carrying such a reduced supply that they had to wait a significant amount of time for delivery
  • Per discussions with the feed mills, they cannot justify carrying the inventory given its shelf life
  • Feed mills also described some uncertainty and concerns over keeping and maintaining the proper paperwork per the VFD for the sale of in feed antibiotic products
Potential financial impacts

- Use very little/no VFD Drug, Valid VCPR
- Use VFD Drugs Extensively, Valid VCPR
- Use very little/no VFD Drug, VCPR Lacking
- Use VFD Drugs Extensively, VCPR Lacking
Potential financial impacts

• Example: >15% clinical presentation of respiratory, then what?
• Usually would treat whole pen with (assume 100 heifers) with in feed antibiotics
• Assumed cost variation between in feed- $290 and single dose injection $285
  • Roughly similar costs with potentially similar results if no additional infections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medication Cost</th>
<th>Labor Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Feed</td>
<td>$2.75 x 100 head = $275</td>
<td>1 hour x $15/hour</td>
<td>$290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Dose Injection</td>
<td>$18 x 15 head = $270</td>
<td>1 hour x $15/hour</td>
<td>$285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Financial Impacts

• Assume a 7 day or 14-21 day delay in being able to get the in feed treatment, in its absence injections are used to treat the additional clinically ill animals

• 7 day delay = additional 15% ill with total of $585 spent

• 14-21 day delay= additional 30% ill with total of $1185 spent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medication Cost</th>
<th>Labor Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 day delay</td>
<td>$18 x additional 15 head</td>
<td>2 hours x $15/hour = $30</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-21 day delay</td>
<td>$18 x additional 30 head</td>
<td>4 hours x $15/hour = $60</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Financial Impacts

• Non-quantifiable impacts
  • Future performance impact (both respiratory and milk production)
  • Future income losses and additional expenses
  • Waiting until clinically presenting as ill may exacerbate or amplify this
  • Overall time spent re-evaluating management options or planning new protocols
Conclusions

• Overall, the VFD rules have encouraged closer relationships with veterinarians
• A shift from treatment to preventative medicine
• Overall more capital investment in facilities design and management than in treatments
• Reactive $\rightarrow$ Proactive
• Total cost difference can’t be known with certainty
• Ultimately a shift in the right direction for animal health