

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **Methane emissions from dairy heifers as affected by residual feed intake and breed**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of

**Master of Science**  
**in**  
**Animal Science**

**at Massey University, Manawatū,  
New Zealand.**

**Holly Ellissa Flay**  
**2018**



## Abstract

---

Reducing methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emissions without reducing milk production requires an improvement in feed conversion efficiency: that is an animal's efficiency in utilising feed for maintenance and production. Residual feed intake (RFI) is one measure of feed conversion efficiency; it can be defined as the difference between an animal's actual intake and its predicted intake based on its metabolic size and productivity. More efficient animals eat less than predicted (low RFI); inefficient animals eat more (high RFI).

Enteric CH<sub>4</sub> is an important source of digestible energy loss in ruminants, and research in beef cattle has reported a positive relationship between RFI and daily CH<sub>4</sub> production. Jersey (Jer) cows have also been reported to be more feed efficient than Holstein-Friesian (HF) cows. Thus, I hypothesized that high feed efficient (low RFI) animals would emit less CH<sub>4</sub> than the lower efficiency (high RFI) animals, and that Jer heifers would have lower CH<sub>4</sub> yield than HF heifers.

I measured the CH<sub>4</sub> emissions of 56 growing dairy heifers (20-22 mo old) in a 2 x 2 factorial arrangement: factors included two breeds (HF and Jer; n=28/breed) and two previously determined RFI categories (low RFI; -2.1 kg DM and high RFI; +2.0 kg DM; n=28/RFI category). All heifers were co-mingled and offered the same diet of dried lucerne cubes. Between RFI categories, heifers did not differ in body weight (BW) or BW gain (BWg); but low RFI heifers had 9.3% and 10.6% lower dry matter intake (DMI) and DMI/kg BW, respectively, than high RFI heifers. Similarly, RFI category did not affect CH<sub>4</sub>/d or CH<sub>4</sub>/kg BWg; but, CH<sub>4</sub>/kg DMI was greater in low RFI heifers because of their lower DMI. These results might reflect more complete digestion of ingested feed in more efficient, low RFI heifers, consistent with previous reports of greater apparent digestibility of organic matter. Breed did not affect DMI/kg BW or BWg; Jersey heifers produced less CH<sub>4</sub>/d, but not CH<sub>4</sub>/kg DMI or CH<sub>4</sub>/kg BWg. In conclusion, selecting dairy heifers for low RFI is unlikely to affect daily CH<sub>4</sub> production (g/d), but may increase CH<sub>4</sub> yield (g/kg DMI).



## Acknowledgments

---

Firstly, my greatest appreciation to my supervisors Dr John Roche, Dr Danny Donaghy, and Dr Nicolas Lopez-Villalobos. I am very grateful to have had the help, support and guidance from three first-class supervisors throughout my Masters.

John, I appreciate your enthusiasm for all things science, and your willingness to give your time to help, no matter where you were in the world. Thank you for the countless meetings to discuss ideas – your invaluable knowledge and feedback contributed greatly to the completion of my thesis. I am incredibly grateful for all the support and guidance you offer.

Danny, you have become a mentor to me, offering a listening ear and friendly chat when I need it. Thank you for spending numerous hours reading and critiquing the drafts I sent – your thoroughness was truly appreciated and did not go unnoticed.

Nicolas, thank you for always being prompt with your replies and making me feel like a priority. Your feedback on statistical advice, additional sections that I had missed, and your encouragement was greatly appreciated, and I know it improved the quality of my thesis.

Thank you also to Barbara Kuhn-Sherlock from DairyNZ for your assistance with the statistical analyses and interpretation, and for enduring continual questions from me.

I am grateful for the assistance of the DairyNZ Technical team and Lye Farm staff during the experiment, especially the technical support of Mark Bryant and Olivia Jordan. Thank you to Kevin Macdonald and Mark Camara for their efforts with ensuring the heifers were delivered to Lye Farm in sufficient time for the experiment.

This Masters was funded by the New Zealand Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Research Centre in support of the objectives of the Livestock Research Group of the Global Research Alliance on Agricultural Greenhouse Gases. I am also very grateful to DairyNZ for the help provided, and in particular Jennie Burke for the professional development and personal support.

My fellow postgraduate students Louise, Charlotte, and Caitlyn, I could not imagine a better group. Thank you for keeping me entertained, fed, sane, and lending intellect when needed.

Lastly, to my family, friends and partner, thank you for being there every step of the way. Particular thanks to Mum and Dad who have provided so much support, reassurance and encouragement throughout my university endeavours and my life. Thank you for always challenging me, but also reminding me that I am capable of the tasks ahead. A big thanks and lots of love to my partner Jesse, for all the love, kindness and weekend adventures. I really could not have done it without you all.



# Table of Contents

---

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Figures</b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>xii</b>
<b>Chapter 1 General Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 2 Literature Review</b> .....	<b>7</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	7
2.2 New Zealand dairy farming system.....	7
2.2.1 New Zealand's unique greenhouse gas situation .....	9
2.3 Methane .....	11
2.3.1 Methane as an energy cost.....	13
2.3.2 Carbohydrates .....	14
2.3.2.1 Non-structural carbohydrates .....	14
2.3.2.2 Fibre .....	15
2.3.3 Ruminant digestive system .....	15
2.3.4 Carbohydrate digestion and metabolism .....	17
2.3.5 Methane production.....	21
2.3.6 Methane phenotypic units .....	22
2.3.6.1 Daily methane production .....	22
2.3.6.2 Methane yield and intensity.....	23
2.3.7 Variation in methane emissions.....	24
2.3.7.1 Diet .....	25
2.3.7.1.1 Dry matter intake.....	25
2.3.7.1.2 Diet composition .....	25
2.3.7.1.3 Quality and processing of feed.....	26
2.3.7.1.4 Rumen microbial population.....	28
2.3.7.2 Age .....	30

2.3.8	Methane mitigation .....	31
2.3.8.1	Ionophores .....	31
2.3.8.2	Antimethanogenic drugs .....	32
2.3.8.3	Feed additives .....	32
2.3.8.4	Methane inhibitors.....	33
2.3.9	Genetics .....	34
2.3.9.1	Genetic correlations .....	34
2.3.9.2	Methane heritability.....	35
2.3.9.3	Breed differences.....	36
2.4	Residual feed intake.....	37
2.4.1	Heritability of RFI.....	40
2.4.2	Variation in residual feed intake.....	41
2.4.2.1	Heat production .....	42
2.4.2.2	Body composition.....	42
2.4.2.3	Physical activity .....	43
2.4.2.4	Feeding behaviour .....	43
2.4.3	Breed differences .....	44
2.5	Methane and residual feed intake .....	44
2.5.1	Residual feed intake and dry matter intake .....	45
2.5.2	Residual feed intake and methane emissions.....	47
2.6	Objectives.....	48
<b>Chapter 3 Methane Measurement Methods.....</b>		<b>49</b>
3.1	Introduction .....	49
3.2	Respiration chambers .....	49
3.3	Sulphur hexafluoride tracer technique.....	52
3.4	GreenFeed system .....	55
3.5	In vitro gas production technique.....	58
<b>Chapter 4 Selecting for low residual feed intake did not affect daily methane production, but increased methane yield in dairy heifers .....</b>		<b>61</b>
4.1	Abstract.....	61
4.2	Introduction .....	62
4.3	Materials and methods .....	63
4.3.1	Data exclusion.....	68

4.3.1.1	Intake data.....	69
4.3.1.2	Methane data.....	72
4.3.1.2.1	Methods for estimating mean daily methane production.....	75
4.3.2	Calculations and statistical analysis .....	80
4.4	Results and Discussion .....	80
4.5	Conclusion.....	84
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>General Discussion .....</b>	<b>89</b>
5.1	Residual feed intake.....	89
5.2	Breed .....	91
5.3	Limitations.....	92
5.3.1	Technology.....	92
5.3.2	Proximity to calving .....	92
5.3.3	Refilling the feed bins .....	93
5.4	Conclusion.....	93
<b>References</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>108</b>
Appendix 1:	American Dairy Science Association Abstract and Presentation.....	108
Appendix 2:	International Symposium for the Nutrition of Herbivores Abstract and Poster .....	120
Appendix 3:	Trapezoidal Mean Methodology.....	122

## List of Figures

---

<b>Figure 1.1.</b> Food consumption per capita of major commodities (kg/person/year) comparatively in the developed vs. the developing world. Dark blue is actual values in 2005/2007. Light blue is projections for 2050 (Alexandratos and Bruinsma, 2012).....	1
<b>Figure 1.2.</b> New Zealand’s greenhouse gas emissions profile for 2016: gross emissions by gas type, gross emissions by sector, agriculture sector emissions by source, and enteric fermentation emissions by livestock category (Ministry for the Environment, 2018).....	4
<b>Figure 2.1.</b> Human population and dairy cattle population of New Zealand from 1990-2017 (Livestock Improvement Corporation and DairyNZ, 2017; StatisticsNZ, 2018).....	8
<b>Figure 2.2.</b> Representation of the synchrony between feed demands and pasture growth and the seasonal pattern of calving, breeding and drying-off in New Zealand (adapted from Roche et al. 2017b).....	10
<b>Figure 2.3.</b> Estimated greenhouse gas emissions per kg of fat and protein corrected milk, averaged across the main regions of the world (Gerber et al., 2010). .....	11
<b>Figure 2.4.</b> The various components of feed (adapted from McDonald et al. 2010). .....	14
<b>Figure 2.5.</b> Diagram of the ruminant four-chambered stomach. Arrows indicate direction of flow of digesta (McDonald et al., 2010).....	16
<b>Figure 2.6.</b> Mean particle sizes of faeces in mammalian hindgut fermenters, non-ruminant foregut fermenters, and ruminants of varying body size (Clauss et al., 2010).....	17
<b>Figure 2.7.</b> Pathways of carbohydrate metabolism in the rumen (van Soest, 1994). .....	19
<b>Figure 2.8.</b> Proposed mechanism for methanogenesis – the reduction of CO <sub>2</sub> to CH <sub>4</sub> by methanogens (Rouviere and Wolfe, 1988).....	22
<b>Figure 2.9.</b> Temporal trends in the concentrations of NDF (■) and ADF (◆), and hemicellulose as a percentage of NDF (▲) in pasture. Least square means for each variable are depicted without connecting lines, while the cosine functions are included in the figure within connecting lines among data points (Roche et al., 2009).....	28
<b>Figure 2.10.</b> Simplified regression model indicating representing the calculation of RFI.	38
<b>Figure 2.11.</b> The partitioning of feed energy in animals. Energy losses are indicated in the red (adapted from McDonald et al. 2010).....	41

<b>Figure 3.1.</b> Schematic of an example of open-circuit respiration chamber. The arrows indicate the direction of air flow. Locations 1 and 2 are the intake and exhaust ducts sample points for non-calibration periods; location 3 is the injection point enabling the analytical system calibration; location 4 is the sample point for the system calibration; and location 5 denotes the chamber volume (Grainger et al., 2007).....	50
<b>Figure 3.2.</b> Illustration of the SF <sub>6</sub> tracer technique methodology (Johnson et al., 1994) ..	53
<b>Figure 3.3.</b> Layout of the GreenFeed system (Hristov et al., 2015a).....	56
<b>Figure 3.4.</b> Diagrammatic representation of the GreenFeed system for measuring CH <sub>4</sub> production incorporated into the custom-built feed stations (C-Lock Inc., Rapid City, SD, USA).....	58
<b>Figure 4.1.</b> Residual feed intake (RFI) of four groups of dairy heifers representing two breeds (Holstein-Friesian and Jersey) and two previously-determined RFI categories (High: +2.0 kg DM; Low: -2.1 kg DM). Heifers were 20-22 mo old; BW = 480 and 408 for HF and Jer, respectively, and 439 and 448 for High and Low RFI, respectively. The RFI is the difference between amount of feed DM required for biological processes and estimated feed requirements based on a regression of feed DM against BW and daily BW gain. Midpoint in each vertical bar is the least square mean for the group; the error bars are the 95% confidence interval.....	65
<b>Figure 4.2.</b> Photos of experimental work in the CH <sub>4</sub> measurement facility at Lye Farm, DairyNZ, Hamilton, New Zealand, using the DMI-CH <sub>4</sub> units (C-Lock Inc., Rapid City, SD, USA).....	66
<b>Figure 4.3.</b> Schematic of the setup of the CH <sub>4</sub> measurement facility.....	67
<b>Figure 4.4.</b> Start mass of the lucerne cubes that were in the feed bin of one DMI-CH <sub>4</sub> station over the dates of 13-21 March 2017: (1) before and (2) after data exclusion criteria were applied, with (a) and (b) highlighting the data that were excluded from analyses.....	71
<b>Figure 4.5.</b> Methane production for all spot measurements plotted over hour of the day for all animals over all measurement days with: (A) all visit data; (B) data with individual animal visit duration >1 min. The red reference lines refer to mean ±2 standard deviations.....	74
<b>Figure 4.6.</b> Plots comparing the three different approaches to estimate the CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from each animal (n = 56). (A) Box plot comparing the distributions of the three methods. (B) Plot of daily mean against arithmetic mean. (C) Plot of trapezoidal mean against	

arithmetic mean. (D) Plot of trapezoidal mean against daily mean. Each plot has a  $y = x$  line through the  $45^\circ$ ..... 77

**Figure 4.7.** Dry matter intake (kg DM/d) of four groups of dairy heifers representing two breeds (Holstein-Friesian and Jersey) and two previously determined RFI categories (High: +2.0 kg DM; Low: -2.1 kg DM). Heifers were 20-22 mo old; BW = 480 and 408 for HF and Jer, respectively, and 439 and 448 for High and Low RFI, respectively. Midpoint in each vertical bar is the least square mean for the group; the error bars are the 95% confidence interval. .... 85

**Figure 4.8.** Methane production (g/d) of four groups of dairy heifers representing two breeds (Holstein-Friesian and Jersey) and two previously determined RFI categories (High: +2.0 kg DM; Low: -2.1 kg DM). Heifers were 20-22 mo old; BW = 480 and 408 for HF and Jer, respectively, and 439 and 448 for High and Low RFI, respectively. Midpoint in each vertical bar is the least square mean for the group; the error bars are the 95% confidence interval. .... 86

**Figure 4.9.** Methane yield (g/kg DMI) of four groups of dairy heifers representing two breeds (Holstein-Friesian and Jersey) and two previously determined RFI categories (High: +2.0 kg DM; Low: -2.1 kg DM). Heifers were 20-22 mo old; BW = 480 and 408 for HF and Jer, respectively, and 439 and 448 for High and Low RFI, respectively. Midpoint in each vertical bar is the least square mean for the group; the error bars are the 95% confidence interval. .... 87

**Figure 4.10.** Methane intensity (g/kg BWg) of four groups of dairy heifers representing two breeds (Holstein-Friesian and Jersey) and two previously determined RFI categories (High: +2.0 kg DM; Low: -2.1 kg DM). Heifers were 20-22 mo old; BW = 480 and 408 for HF and Jer, respectively, and 439 and 448 for High and Low RFI, respectively. Midpoint in each vertical bar is the least square mean for the group; the error bars are the 95% confidence interval. .... 88

**Figure A3.1.** Plot of  $CH_4$  spot measurement data for Animal 4 over day of trial 8-10. The plot depicts the trapezoidal mean approach through the linear interpolation for midnight by the black crosses, and the area under the curve by the shading.....124

## List of Tables

---

<b>Table 2.1.</b> Theoretical stoichiometric carbon-hydrogen balance equations describing conversion of glucose in the rumen (van Soest, 1994).....	13
<b>Table 2.2.</b> Several CH <sub>4</sub> phenotypes with their definitions, units, strengths, and weaknesses (adapted from de Haas et al. 2017).....	24
<b>Table 2.3.</b> Stoichiometric parameters for the fermentation of substrate in the rumen (moles VFA produced per mole substrate fermented) for roughage diets (>60% roughage) (Dijkstra, 1994).....	26
<b>Table 2.4.</b> Major species of rumen microorganisms and their substrates, products, and requirements (van Soest, 1994).....	30
<b>Table 2.5.</b> DMI, CH <sub>4</sub> production (g/d) and CH <sub>4</sub> yield (g/kg DMI) from cattle selected for variance in RFI. (Waghorn and Hegarty 2011).....	46
<b>Table 4.1.</b> Number of observations of CH <sub>4</sub> spot measurements from the GreenFeed units and the mean, median and standard deviation when removing data of different minimum visit duration.....	72
<b>Table 4.2.</b> Averages and correlations for the three different approaches to estimate the CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from each animal (n = 56). Along the diagonal is the mean ± between-animal standard deviation. Above the diagonal is the correlation coefficient. Below the diagonal is the R-squared.....	76
<b>Table 4.3.</b> Heat map for the frequency of the CH <sub>4</sub> spot measurements per animal per day for Cohort 1.....	78
<b>Table 4.4.</b> Heat map for the frequency of the CH <sub>4</sub> spot measurements per animal per day for Cohort 2.....	79
<b>Table 4.5.</b> Least square means for groups representing two breeds (Holstein-Friesian: HF; and Jersey: Jer, n = 28/breed) and two pre-determined residual feed intake (RFI <sup>1</sup> ) categories (Low: -2.0 kg DMI/d and High: +2.0 kg DMI/d, n = 28/RFI category). Animals were 20-22 mo old dairy heifers and were offered unlimited access to dried lucerne cubes.....	81

## List of Abbreviations

---

ADF	Acid-detergent fibre
ATP	Adenosine triphosphate
BW	Body weight
BW <sup>0.75</sup>	Metabolic body weight
BWg	Body weight gain
CH <sub>4</sub>	Methane
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
CO <sub>2</sub> -eq	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DM	Dry matter
DMI	Dry matter intake
FCE	Feed conversion efficiency
GHG	Greenhouse gas
HF	Holstein-Friesian
h <sup>2</sup>	Heritability
IVGPT	In vitro gas production technique
Jer	Jersey
NDF	Neutral-detergent fibre
RFI	Residual feed intake
SF <sub>6</sub>	Sulphur hexafluoride
VFA	volatile fatty acid
3NOP	3-nitrooxypropanol