

Springwood Livestock Management Service

1891 Rockdale Rd
Wytheville, VA 24382

Andrew W. Meadows, MS, DVM
540-520-2609

2015 Shenandoah County Fair

4-H/FFA Steer Ultrasound Data Explanation

Column A:	Exhibitor
Column B:	Tag Number
Column C:	Live Wt. (provided by Shenandoah County Extension Office)
Column D:	Carcass Wt. (ending live wt. x 63.5% dressing)
Column E:	Ultrasound rib eye area
Column F:	Average REA required (based on carcass weight)
Column G:	Ultrasound Rib Fat
Column H:	Ultrasound %IMF
Column I:	Marbling Score (based on %IMF and used to determine quality grade)
Column J:	Quality Grade (based on ultrasound data, <u>NOT</u> Live quality grade)
Column K:	Yield Grade (calculated using carcass wt., REA, and back fat)
Column L:	% Retail Product (calculated based on carcass weight, back fat, and muscling)
Column M:	Final Rank

Pertinent Facts:

- 1) Steers were disqualified if they had a:
 - A: hot carcass wt. of less than 600 pounds or more than 950 pounds
 - B: Yield grade of 4.0 or higher
 - C: Quality grade of Select – or lower

****This year steers were ranked by quality and yield with the top 10 steers being recognized for having “best” carcasses that excelled in muscling, leanness, and yield grade, while maintaining a choice quality grade.**

Steer #1 is the best combination of muscling, leanness, and quality grade. He excels in muscling with a 17.0 REA, is extremely lean at .29 inches of back fat, and still boasts enough marbling to make the average choice grade, all while having the highest Percent Retail Product figure. He wins the carcass competition by a significant margin.

Steers 1-18 meet industry standards – all being choice cattle and yield grade 1-2's. However, Steers 11-17 give up an advantage in muscling and leanness to the top 10 steers.

Steer 18 boasts the highest quality grade carcass in the competition, but is simply average on muscling and gives up the necessary leanness required to work his way higher in the rankings.

Steers 19-21 vary in the amount of muscling that they bring, in addition to having a wide range of back fat measurements; bottom line, all three steers do not have the quality grade to complement their acceptable yield grade calculations.

Steers 22-29 have acceptable quality grade but are suffering in their yield grade calculations due to individual differences in muscling and fat cover. In most cases, either higher REA measurements or lower rib fat values would have improved their yield grade and moved them higher in the rankings.

Steers 30 and 31 are acceptable on muscling but carrying more than an acceptable amount of rib fat which has pushed them into the high yield grade 3 bracket.

Steer 32 was disqualified because it weighed in later than the others in March. If not disqualified, it would have been ranked 8th.

Steers 33-35 were all disqualified due to being YG4 cattle. In all three cases they needed additional muscling and less rib fat to drop into a lower YG field. Steer 35 also failed to measure with an adequate marbling score and was disqualified on his Low Select QG as well.

2015 Shenandoah County Fair
Market Steer Ultrasound Competition

Exhibitor	ID	Live Wt	Carcass Wt	Ultrasound REA	Avg. REA (for carcass wt)	Ultrasound Rib Fat	Ultrasound %IMF	Marbling Score	Quality Grade	Yield Grade	% Retail Product	Rank
John-Robert Helsley	844	1201	763	17.0	13.0	0.29	07.47	1156	Choice ⁰	1.2	75.5	1
Gracie Holzbauer	722	1211	769	15.2	13.0	0.30	06.90	1132	Choice ⁰	1.8	74.2	2
Tiffany Heishman	423	1174	745	15.5	12.7	0.45	05.13	1049	Choice -	2.0	71.7	3
Houston Kibler	767	1166	740	14.0	12.7	0.34	05.02	1044	Choice -	2.2	72.8	4
Reagan Bowman	793	1177	747	13.8	12.8	0.32	06.88	1131	Choice ⁰	2.2	73.1	5
Elizabeth Funkhouser	838	1244	790	13.8	13.3	0.28	04.68	1027	Choice -	2.3	73.8	6
Mariyah Viar	724	1125	714	14.6	12.4	0.52	06.87	1130	Choice ⁰	2.3	70.0	7
Bethany Gochenour	839	1405	892	16.0	14.5	0.49	05.40	1063	Choice -	2.5	71.3	8
Kyle Lutz	772	1281	813	15.0	13.6	0.50	06.80	1127	Choice ⁰	2.5	70.6	9
Luke Whitacre	720	1356	861	15.8	14.1	0.55	05.79	1081	Choice -	2.6	70.1	10
Alexander Neff	729	1074	682	12.8	12.0	0.44	07.64	1163	Choice ⁰	2.6	70.4	11
Tyler Holzbauer	723	1392	884	14.6	14.4	0.37	07.90	1174	Choice ⁰	2.6	72.7	12
Elizabeth Funkhouser	718	1258	799	13.7	13.4	0.40	07.24	1146	Choice ⁰	2.7	71.6	13
Reagan Bowman	794	1175	746	13.1	12.8	0.44	05.13	1049	Choice -	2.7	70.7	14
Isaac Rhodes	422	1389	882	15.0	14.4	0.48	06.49	1114	Choice ⁰	2.8	70.9	15
Walker Bowman	796	1322	839	14.0	13.9	0.42	04.98	1042	Choice -	2.8	71.4	16
Bethany Gochenour	840	1262	801	14.1	13.4	0.51	06.26	1103	Choice ⁰	2.8	69.9	17
Ethan Neff	736	1211	769	13.5	13.0	0.53	09.07	1218	Choice+	2.9	69.2	18
Jeremy Viar	725	1207	766	13.5	13.0	0.24	03.34	955	Select +	2.2	74.3	19
Kennedy Whetzel	717	1360	864	17.5	14.2	0.66	03.89	985	Select +	2.3	69.1	20
Jenna Kibler	770	1376	874	16.2	14.3	0.50	03.38	957	Select+	2.4	71.2	21
Kyle Lutz	773	1327	843	15.5	13.9	0.69	08.52	1198	Choice ⁰	3.0	67.5	22
Shane Dodson	833	1123	713	10.4	12.4	0.26	05.69	1077	Choice -	3.0	72.4	23
Jenna Kibler	768	1330	845	14.1	13.9	0.57	05.66	1075	Choice -	3.1	68.8	24
Walker Bowman	795	1314	834	11.9	13.8	0.34	04.96	1041	Choice -	3.2	71.7	24
John-Robert Helsley	843	1244	790	12.9	13.3	0.55	07.45	1155	Choice ⁰	3.2	68.5	26
Jeffrey "JJ" Bingaman	792	1173	745	12.4	12.7	0.59	07.48	1156	Choice ⁰	3.3	67.5	27
Branson Ritchie	721	1391	883	13.6	14.4	0.56	08.41	1194	Choice ⁰	3.4	68.8	28
Garrett Cummins	826	1493	948	13.4	15.2	0.50	06.52	1115	Choice ⁰	3.6	69.7	29
Luke Whitacre	719	1358	862	14.0	14.1	0.76	08.10	1182	Choice ⁰	3.7	65.4	30
Connor Neff	728	1290	819	14.7	13.6	0.92	06.96	1134	Choice ⁰	3.7	62.9	31
Hailey Shoemaker	716	1374	872	14.6	14.3	0.29	05.20	1053	Choice -	2.4	74.2	DQ
Kara Hockman	845	1207	766	12.7	13.0	0.86	06.89	1131	Choice ⁰	4.0	62.9	DQ
Tessa Hockman	846	1453	923	14.3	14.9	0.86	07.06	1139	Choice ⁰	4.1	63.8	DQ
Jacob Coffey	761	1480	940	14.7	15.1	0.92	02.27	894	Select -	4.2	62.9	DQ