

Shelley, Idaho
December 12, 1977

Mr. Rollin J. Anderson
Azome Utah Mining Company
Sterling, Utah 84665

Dear Rollin:

My intentions, for quite sometime, have been to inform you of some of the results I have experienced personally and those reported by others using Azomite here in Eastern Idaho, which can definitely be attributed to the use of Azomite. These relate to supplementing feed formulas for livestock and poultry, and also to soil management practices. However, one recent experience which is creating considerable attention at this time prompts me to write this letter.

This has to do with a family-owned feedlot operation which has been in continuous operation for some 20 years. Here good management and records are maintained and the operators have been good enough to provide me with the following information which I am sure will interest you.

This feedlot has the capacity to feed up to 2,000 head of beef cattle. They generally maintain from 1,600 to 1,800 animals made up of Holsteins, Herefords and Angus in the lot most of the time. Each kind of animal is kept in separate pens, weighing in at approximately 600 pounds each. They are then fed for 120 days when they are moved to the packing house which purchases them on a live weight basis and according to the grading quality as determined by the packing house.

The operators began feeding Azomite early last spring when their cattle had gone off feed. Azomite seemed to quickly correct the problem. At that time they became interested in continuing with the use of Azomite in their feeding program. I advised them that I had not had any personal experience feeding beef cattle and thought there might be a possibility that with animals coming into the feedlot weighing about 600 pounds and then fed for a period of only 120 days, when they were moved out, the minerals in Azomite might not have an opportunity to help develop any noticeable results within such a short period of time. However, the mineral elements in Azomite are apparently absorbed and assimilated by animals of that size much faster than expected. The results that have developed during that length of time have surprised everyone involved.

Part of the time they feed a wet fermented potato silage made from culls and below grade potatoes. This is added to cured alfalfa and barley, mostly raised on their own mineral-rich lava-ash soil. At the time, they were of the opinion that in judging the chemical analysis of Azomite it was doubtful the adding of it to the formula could improve it as far as results might be concerned. However, results have changed their doubts to smiles of approval.

When using the wet potato silage they have been adding Azomite to the formula at the rate of 2 percent of the weight volume due to the heavy water content. Later, they go to a dry formula of alfalfa, barley and some drier potato silage. To this Azomite is added at the rate of about 5 percent - 100 pounds to the ton. Recently, I understand they started adding

"Remensin" a sodium derivative. However, it is too soon for them to make any evaluation of results from its use. They maintain a regular measured feed schedule for all pens, So they know cost and results that develop.

Prior to adding Azomite to the feed formula the average weight gain per head per day had never exceeded 3 pounds. Since including Azomite in the feeding program the average gain per day per head has not been less than 4 pounds. One pen, this last summer, averaged 4.9 pounds gain per day.

They analyze the total cost of feeding each lot of animals on an average cost per head for each 120-day cycle. Prior to feeding Azomite this cost averaged approximately \$140.00 per head. Since Azomite was added, the animals, so far, have finished out at an average cost of \$95.00 per head. This, of course, has been quite impressive.

The improvement in the grading of the animals since adding Azomite has been cause for the packing house management to comment: "We've never seen anything like it!" Prior to using Azomite Holsteins were averaging 50 percent choice. The last two groups marketed, the Holsteins averaged 75 percent choice. One particular lot graded out at 85 percent choice. The Herefords and Angus had been averaging 65 percent choice prior to Azomite and after adopting the Azomite program the grading average for choice has increased to 85 and 90 percent. The choice grading brings an extra 4 cents per pound premium to the feedlot operators. This has meant an increase in profits, up to \$45.00 more per head for the animals grading choice. Taking this into consideration along with the reduction in cost of feeding now appears to be a possible breakthrough in feedlot practices.

Other factors that have been impressive have to do with improvements in the health of the animals and the reduction in the incidence of bloat when feeding wet silage; a problem in the past. Medication and mortality have been drastically reduced.

This particular experience demonstrates how effective the mineral elements in Azomite can be and how quickly they become effective. This, in spite of the mineral-rich feed coming from mineral-rich soil where grown. While these results are impressive, they perhaps are to be expected when comparing results that develop when Azomite is fed to dairy cattle, swine and poultry here in Eastern Idaho. I realize feed quality can vary in mineral content from one area to another, but I feel that others inclined to feed Azomite as suggested, in other localities, will observe results comparable to what is being observed here in Idaho as Azomite seems to work well in any type of ration.

Keep up the good work in making Azomite available. It is a wonderful product that seems to be well balanced and readily acceptable by livestock, poultry and plant life.

Sincerely,

Delray Fielding

Delray Fielding