**Interpretive summary**

Previous studies reported bedded packs improve cow welfare and comfort and have advantages for manure management, soil health, and water quality. Consensus is lacking on whether bulk tank milk quality, udder health, udder hygiene and milk production are compromised on bedded packs. In an observational study measuring these metrics during the non-grazing season (typically November-May) on 21 organic dairies in Vermont, bedded packs were similar to tiestalls and freestalls in the aforementioned outcomes. We conclude that bedded packs are a viable option for dairy cattle housing during the non-grazing season in the Northeastern US.
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**Abstract**

The primary objective of this cross-sectional observational study on organic dairies was to determine whether bulk tank milk quality, udder health, udder hygiene and milk production outcomes were associated with facility type. A secondary objective was to identify other management-related risk factors associated with bulk tank milk quality, udder health, udder hygiene, and milk production on organic dairy herds in Vermont. We aimed to collect bulk tank milk samples, udder hygiene scores, and complete a questionnaire on mastitis risk and bedding management practices on 40 farms, in order to compare herds using the two most common housing systems (freestalls, tiestalls) with those using a bedded pack, for organic dairy cattle in the state during the non-grazing season (typically November-May). Due to the limited sample size available using bedded packs in the state to house lactating dairy cattle, it was necessary to combine both untilled and cultivated bedded pack systems for analysis in order to achieve our objective of describing udder hygiene, milk quality, and udder health on these loose-housing systems deeply-bedded with organic material. The study was completed on 21 farms (5 bedded packs, 6 freestalls, 10 tiestalls) before interruption due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Data captured from Dairy Herd Improvement Association records from the test closest to the date of the farm visit included average somatic cell score (SCS), standardized 150-day milk (pounds), % cows with current high SCS (SCS ≥4.0), % cows with newly elevated SCS (previous SCS <4.0 to current ≥4.0), and % cows with chronically elevated SCS (SCS ≥4.0 last two tests). Multivariable linear regression models were performed to describe outcomes by facility type, but suffered from limited statistical power due to small group sample sizes. Final results from unconditional comparisons showed that farms using each of the three facility types did not differ in metrics captured from Dairy Herd Improvement Association test data (cow-level udder health measures, milk production), bulk tank milk somatic cell count (BTSCC) and aerobic culture data, or udder hygiene scores. Subsequently, a secondary analysis was conducted using univariate linear regression to identify associations between herd management factors and outcomes for all 21 farms combined. Although not all differences found were statistically significant in this secondary analysis which combined all farms, numeric differences that may be biologically important are reported showing farms with deeper bedding had a lower BTSCC, lower newly elevated SCS, lower elevated current SCS, lower average SCS, and better udder hygiene metrics. Farms with lower mean udder hygiene scores had numerically lower chronically elevated SCS, lower elevated current SCS, and lower average SCS. The current study provides insight on factors affecting bulk tank milk quality, udder health and hygiene measures on organic dairy farms in Vermont. Because outcomes for bedded packs were comparable to more frequently used indoor housing systems (tiestalls and freestalls), we conclude that bedded pack facilities are a viable option for confinement during the non-grazing season for pasture-based herds interested in a loose-housing system in the Northeastern US.
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**Introduction**

Mastitis due to environmental pathogens, such as those commonly found in bedding material, has now become the “most common and costly form of mastitis in modern dairy herds” that have implemented standard mastitis control practices limiting the effect of contagious pathogens (Klaas and Zadoks, 2018). Teats of dairy cattle may be in direct contact with bedding materials for 40 to 60% of the day, making this an important potential source of exposure to opportunistic environmental mastitis pathogens (Tucker and Weary, 2004; Cook et al., 2005; Hogan and Smith, 2012). Work exploring how bedding materials relate to a cow’s risk of contracting mastitis has understandably focused on the most frequently used bedding materials and housing systems in the dairy industry. Currently, the most common type of dairy cattle housing for organic farms in Vermont is a tiestall barn, with freestall barns a distant second (Andrews et al., 2021). As consumer opinion about confinement housing of dairy cattle evolves and influences dairy policy, both the dairy industry and consumers are looking to move away from traditional housing systems which restrict cow movement (Barkema et al., 2015). Many smaller-scale organic dairy farmers in Vermont with aging facilities, and especially tiestall barns, may be looking to adopt a bedded pack system on their farms as a form of loose-housing (Andrews et al., 2021). The term “bedded pack” encompasses a variety of management styles (Bewley et al., 2017), including compost bedded-packs (CBP), which utilize aerobic decomposition to break down a bedding material of fine wood sawdust or shavings (The Dairyland Initiative, 2024)- citation needs to be added later by hand) (Bewley et al., 2017; Endres, 2021), as well as “traditional” or “deep bedded packs” (The Dairyland Initiative, 2024)- citation needs to be added later by hand) (Thurgood, 2009; Benson, 2012; Bewley et al., 2017). In a traditional bedded pack system, large volumes of straw or hay are added daily to an untilled system in which strata of bedding and waste accumulate throughout the period of time when cows are housed on it; oxygen is retained in the system by the selection of bedding material and the timing of its application (Neher et al., 2022). For the current purposes of the study, the inclusive term “bedded pack” was used to encompass both types of systems, and was defined as an enclosed loose housing facility deeply bedded with organic material, in which bedding and waste accumulate throughout the 6–8-month period of time when cows are housed on it and which is only removed once a year. Both systems use carbon-rich substrates to create a clean, comfortable surface which allows animals to move freely, and urine and manure are not removed when bedding material is renewed, in contrast with other housing systems. Bedded packs (BP) are perceived to integrate well into pasture-based farm systems, and state and federal agencies in the U.S. are providing financial incentives for dairies to build these structures as part of manure management practices which improve water quality and contribute to soil conservation (USDA; Andrews et al., 2021).

As interest in BP grows, it is important to better understand milk quality, udder health and hygiene on farms using these housing alternatives. Understanding mastitis risk for cattle housed on BP is especially important for organic dairy farm ers, as they have limited effective options for treating intramammary infections (Ruegg, 2009). As mastitis-causing bacteria may thrive in the conditions found in compost bedded-packs (Black et al., 2014), previous work studying mastitis risk and bedding would suggest BP could pose a relatively higher risk for intramammary infections. Loose-housed cows continually add manure to the bedded pack, contributing both pathogenic bacteria (non-*aureus* staphylococci, Wuytak et. al., 2020; *E. coli*, *Klebsiella* spp., and *Enterobacter* spp., Eberhart, 1984; streptococci, Zadoks et al., 2005) and nutrients to the organic bedding material. Organic bedding material is more likely to have a higher bacterial count than inorganic bedding, such as sand, (Hogan et al., 1989; Rowbotham and Ruegg, 2016b), as it supplies nutrients and moisture which encourages bacterial growth. This could lead to higher concentrations of bacteria on teat skin for cows on BP, because: 1) organic bedding (in general) is inherently associated with a higher number of bacteria on teat ends (Fairchild et al., 1982; Rowbotham and Ruegg, 2016b), and 2) a higher concentration of bacteria in bedding is associated with a higher concentration of bacteria on teat ends (Hogan and Smith, 1997; Zdanowicz et al., 2004; Rowbotham and Ruegg, 2016b). This higher concentration of bacteria on teat ends may put the mammary gland at an increased risk of infection, although limited evidence exists for this relationship (Neave et al., 1966; Pankey, 1989; Rowbotham and Ruegg, 2016a).

Previous work describing mastitis risk and cow hygiene on bedded pack systems includes descriptive studies of CBP (Barberg et al., 2007b; Black et al., 2013; Fávero et al., 2015; Eckelkamp et al., 2016b; Albino et al., 2018; Heins et al., 2019). However, research comparing milk quality and cow hygiene between bedded pack systems and more traditional housing types has so far been limited to freestalls with sand, which is an uncommon housing type for organic farms in Vermont (Andrews et al. 2021. These include a study comparing CBP and sand-bedded freestalls for farms with a history of low bulk tank somatic cell counts (Eckelkamp et al., 2016a), work describing hygiene and bulk tank milk somatic cell count (BTSCC) for sand-bedded freestalls and CBP (Adkins et al., 2022), and a comparison of CBP and two types of freestall barns (Lobeck et al., 2011). It is unclear whether the herds included in these prior studies were conventionally-managed or organic dairies. To the best of our knowledge, no studies describe and compare bulk tank milk quality, udder health and hygiene on bedded pack farms and tiestall barns of similar size and management style.

To better inform organic dairy producers in the Northeastern US, who may be interested in using a bedded pack barn for housing their cattle during the non-grazing season (typically the months of November-May), we conducted a cross-sectional, observational study on organic dairies in Vermont. This study aimed to quantify bulk tank milk bacteriology, udder health and udder hygiene measures for the two most common indoor housing systems (freestalls, tiestalls) and farms using a bedded pack for organic farms in Vermont. The objectives of this project were to identify whether bulk tank milk quality, udder health and hygiene outcomes differed by facility type, with a view to determining if bedded pack systems are a viable option for indoor housing of lactating cows in VT during the non-grazing season. We hypothesized that udder health, hygiene, and bulk tank milk bacteriology of bedded pack herds is inferior to that of more traditional housing types, as has been suggested by some previous research (Peeler et al., 2000; Fregonesi and Leaver, 2001; Barberg et al., 2007b; Lobeck et al., 2011). A secondary objective was to identify other (non-facility) management-related risk factors associated with bulk tank milk quality, udder health, udder hygiene, and milk production for organic VT dairy herds.

**Materials and Methods**

STROBE-VET (Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology–Veterinary Extension) statement guidelines were followed in the reporting of this study (O'Connor et al., 2016).

**Herd enrollment and selection**

The source population for this study was the 145 farms that responded to a survey sent to all certified organic dairy farms producing cow milk in Vermont in Winter 2018-2019 (all farms, n = 177). Certified organic dairy farms in the United States are required to allow their cows daily access to pasture during the grazing season, and cows must obtain 30% of their dry matter intake from grazing (Rinehart and Baier, 2011). When cows are not on pasture, organic farms in Vermont house cows in a variety of indoor facility types. The Winter 2018-2019 survey aimed to quantify the frequency and diversity of indoor housing and bedding types used by organic dairy farmers in the state when cows were not on pasture (Andrews et al., 2021). Dairy farms were eligible for enrollment in the current study if they: 1) responded to the initial survey in the Winter 2018-2019, 2) indicated they met the enrollment criteria of testing with the Dairy Herd Improvement Association (DHIA) at least monthly, 3) milked between 35 and 120 cows, and 4) indicated they would be interested in further participation. Eligible farms were contacted from this source population in Spring 2019 if they responded that they were using one of four categories of bedding/housing combinations for their indoor housing system: 1) freestall barn bedded with sand, 2) freestall (FS) barn bedded with shavings or sawdust, 3) tiestall (TS) barn bedded with shavings or sawdust, or 4) a bedded pack system, The first three housing and bedding combinations are the most frequently used by organic dairies in Vermont to house cows during the non-grazing season, and were compared to BP as they were the housing type of interest for this project. A convenience sample of farms was enrolled in Spring 2019 from a list of eligible farms (grouped by housing/bedding combination) using the phone number or email address provided in the 2018-2019 survey response. Our aim was to enroll 40 farms for the current study, with 10 farms from each of the four housing/bedding categories described above.

Prior to obtaining the 2018-2019 survey results, based on preliminary data collected by the University of Vermont Center for Sustainable Agriculture Extension group, the study was designed anticipating that it would be possible to enroll 10 organic Vermont dairies using a bedded pack system as their primary indoor housing system. However, out of the 17 farms from the 2018-2019 survey which indicated at least some use of a bedded pack system, one farm was not interested in any further participation, five did not use DHIA testing, and six only used a bedded pack system as a secondary housing system in conjunction with a TS barn, or cows were only on the pack a few hours a day. Because the number of farms using BP was fewer than anticipated, the eligibility requirements were relaxed to include one farm where cows spend the majority (two-thirds) of their time in a bedded pack, with the remaining time in a TS with wood shavings. Additionally, two bedded pack farms were included that had limited DHIA information: one farm did not utilize cow-level testing, and cow-level data for a second farm was limited due to their seasonal lactation schedule. As the number of BP being used in the state to house lactating dairy cattle was less than anticipated, those that were enrolled and grouped together utilized a variety of management strategies. Of the 5 enrolled farms using a bedded pack system, two would be classified as “compost bedded-packs,” utilizing aerobic decomposition to break down a bedding material of dry, fine wood sawdust or shavings (The Dairyland Initiative, 2024)- citation needs to be added later by hand) (Bewley et al., 2017; Endres, 2021). These two farms bedded solely with shavings/sawdust, adding new bedding only as needed, and cultivated the pack twice a day. Two other farms used a “traditional” or “deep bedded pack” system, where large volumes of fresh, dry straw (or poor-quality hay) sufficient to keep cows clean and dry was added daily to a mass of bedding that accumulates over the 6-8 months cows are housed indoors (The Dairyland Initiative, 2024)- citation needs to be added later by hand) (Thurgood, 2009; Benson, 2012; Bewley et al., 2017) The one remaining farm fell somewhere between these two types of classically defined bedded packs; this farm bedded with straw and woodchips and cultivated every 48 hrs., adding chopped hay and woodchips every time the pack was cultivated. All farms in the study grouped as “bedded packs” shared the qualities of being an enclosed loose housing facility, deeply bedded with organic material (0.9-1.7 meters), which accumulated over the period of time animals were housed indoors and was only removed once a year.

Of the intended 40 herds to be recruited in the study, 21 herds (1 FS bedded with sand, 5 FS bedded with wood shavings/sawdust, 10 TS bedded with wood shavings/sawdust, 5 BP) agreed to participate and farm visits were completed April-May 2019. Each herd was visited once during the study period. All herds sampled during this period were housing their cows as they would in the non-grazing season. Farm visits were suspended in mid-May 2019 as farms began turning their cows out to pasture, with the intention of resuming in April 2020 to complete the remaining 19 herds. Due to COVID-19 pandemic activity restrictions, the decision was made to not resume the study, and the final analysis included the 21 herds sampled in 2019. As there was only one farm sampled using a FS facility bedded with sand, the initial plan to group farms by the four housing/bedding combinations specified was abandoned in favor of grouping farms by the three facility types used. The single sand FS was combined with FS bedded with wood shavings/sawdust (FS; n = 6), there were 10 TS bedded with wood shavings/sawdust (TS), and 5 BP.

**Questionnaire administration, sampling, and udder hygiene scoring**

At each farm visit, a questionnaire was administered to collect information about housing and bedding management, as well as other practices on the farm that could impact mastitis risk (Supplemental Data). The study questionnaire was largely adapted from a previously published survey (Stiglbauer et al., 2013), with additional questions specific to the current study. The questionnaire was reviewed by a social scientist experienced in gathering qualitative data and tested before use with herd managers at the University of Vermont teaching dairy. Questions about mastitis risk explored producer concerns about bedding/mastitis risk; mastitis control, identification and record keeping; milking facilities, procedures, and hygiene practices; information about diet, vitamin and mineral supplementation, and water source; typical calving and periparturient practices; and fly control. Questions about housing and bedding management included describing type of housing system used for both lactating and dry cows; classification and description of any bedding material used; and bedding management practices for each housing type used. The questionnaire also collected some basic herd information (production numbers; number of lactating, dry, and youngstock; breed; record-keeping systems). Farms using bedded pack systems were asked additional questions to gather detailed information about bedded pack construction, management, monitoring practices, and perceptions comparing BP to any previously used systems. Completion of the questionnaire required 45 minutes on average, ranging from about 30 minutes to 1.5 hours. The questionnaire and interview protocols were registered with the University of Vermont Institutional Review Board (IRB certification 19-0057). The questionnaire was created and administered on a tablet using KoboCollect software (KoboCollect, 2019).

At each farm visit, a bulk tank milk sample collected directly from the top of the tank using a 250-mL sterile single-use vial (Blue Dippas™, Dynalon Products, England) after at least 5 minutes of agitation. Samples were kept on ice in a cooler during transport until they were processed fresh for SCC measurement or were frozen and stored at −20°C in the laboratory, before being sent to a diagnostic lab for microbiological analysis. An on-farm observation sheet was completed, which collected information about the bulk tank, cow identification, a subjective assessment of air quality, and any outdoor exercise area (Supplemental Data). Additionally, measurements of the housing facilities were recorded for FS and TS where appropriate (stall sizes, pen sizes, bedding depth, stocking density, trainer use), as well as observations about BP when applicable (depth, pen size, and stocking density in m2 per animal). Bedding depth of FS and TS was included as a producer reported value in the questionnaire. Bedding depth of bedded pack facilities was measured by forcing a meter stick down to the level of the cement pad or gravel under the pack, where the pack met a cement knee wall, and recording the height of the bedded pack at that point. Udder hygiene scoring was completed by the same researcher at all farms for a minimum of 30 cows on each farm (the first 30 able to be evaluated in a loose pen, or the first 30 encountered in a tiestall). A four-point udder hygiene scoring system was used, where 1 = free of dirt, 2 = slightly dirty (2–10% of surface area), 3 = moderately covered with dirt (10–30% of surface area), and 4 = covered with caked on-dirt (>30% of surface area) (Schreiner and Ruegg, 2002). Animal use for this project was approved by the University of Vermont Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC; protocol #PROTO202000089).

**Herd-level udder health measurements**

Herd-level DHIA test results for the test day closest in time to the farm visit (either preceding or following day of farm visit, whichever was shorter) were captured from the record processing center working with each herd (Lancaster DHIA, Manheim, PA; Dairy One Co-Op. Inc., Ithaca, NY). Information captured included test date, number of lactating cows, standardized 150-day milk production (STD 150-day milk), and test-day average cow-level somatic cell score (SCS). The following udder health measures were also captured from DHIA records: proportion of cows with an SCC ≥200,000 cells/mL on most recent test day (“elevSCS”), where elevated SCS was defined as a somatic cell score of ≥4.0; the proportion of cows with a newly elevated SCS (“newSCS”), which was defined as a SCS changing from <4.0 to ≥4.0 over the last 2 tests; and the proportion of cows with a chronically elevated SCS (“chronSCS”), which was defined as having a SCS ≥4.0 on the last two tests (Schukken et al., 2003).

**Bulk tank milk culture and bulk tank somatic cell count measures**

An aliquot of the bulk tank milk sample was stored at -4°C until it could be transported to the laboratory of a dairy processing plant (St. Alban’s Cooperative/Dairy Farmers of America, St. Albans, VT) within 48 hours of collection for determination of the bulk tank somatic cell count (BTSCC).

Frozen bulk tank milk samples were shipped on ice to the Laboratory for Udder Health (University of Minnesota Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, St. Paul) for analysis. Methodology for bulk tank milk cultures at the Laboratory of Udder Health are described elsewhere (Patel et al., 2019). Briefly, thawed, room-temperature bulk tank milk and a 10-fold dilution of each bulk tank milk sample were plated onto MacConkey, Factor (gram-positive selective agar; University of Minnesota), and Focus (selective for SSLO bacteria; University of Minnesota) media plates and incubated for two days at 37°C. Any lactose-fermenting colonies on MacConkey medium were counted and reported as coliform bacteria. Any β-hemolytic colonies on Focus medium were counted and identified to the species level using a MALDI Biotyper (suspect *Streptococcus agalactiae*). All remaining colonies on Focus medium that were not identified as *Strep. agalactiae* were counted and recorded as streptococci or strep-like organisms (SSLO). Hemolytic colonies on Factor medium were counted and identified to the species level using a MALDI Biotyper (suspect *Staph. aureus*). Any hemolytic colonies with a confidence score ≥2.0 for *Staph. aureus* were counted and reported as such. Remaining colonies of staphylococci on Factor media (based on colony morphology, catalase reaction, or Gram stain) were counted and reported as *Staph.* spp. Bulk tank samples were also cultured for *Mycoplasma* spp. (0.1 mL milk was swabbed across a Mycoplasma agar plate, then placed in a 7% CO2 incubator at 37°C for 7 days, after which they were examined for *Mycoplasma* spp. by a trained microbiology technician). For each bulk tank milk sample, total colony-forming units (cfu) per mL were calculated for coliform organisms, *Staph.* spp., streptococci and strep-like organisms (SSLO), *Staph. aureus*, *Strep. agalactiae*, and *Mycoplasma* spp. The lower threshold of detection for bacteria in this bulk tank milk culture protocol was 5 cfu/mL, and the upper threshold was 62,500 cfu/mL.

**Data management and analysis**

Bulk tank milk culture results, BTSCC, DHIA test results, farm-level udder hygiene outcomes, questionnaire data, and farm observations were entered into an Excel database (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA). Udder hygiene scores for individual cows were used to calculate two farm-level udder hygiene measures: 1) mean udder hygiene score, and 2) proportion of cows with dirty udders (udder hygiene score ≥3), which were incorporated into the database. This Excel database was then imported into the R Statistical Programming Environment (R Development Core Team, 2023) for data cleaning, checking, and statistical analysis. The distribution of outcome variables was assessed to check for normality using a Shapiro-Wilk test with significance set at *P* ≤0.05, visual assessment of distribution and residuals, skewness, and comparison of the median and mean values. Raw bulk tank somatic cell count (BTSCC) data was log10 transformed for analyses. Descriptive statistics were calculated to evaluate the distribution of data, data integrity, and to identify missing data. Descriptive statistics generated included description of general herd characteristics and farm traits, lactating cow housing/facilities, lactating cow bedding material/bedding management practices, milking hygiene procedures, and mastitis control practices for all 21 herds included in the study.

*Objective 1. Evaluation of relationships between housing system and measures of milk quality, udder health, udder hygiene and milk production.* As most measures of aerobic culture data were not normally distributed even after log transformation, a Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare cfu counts of bacteria from bulk tank milk between the three facility types. Statistical significance for this test was declared at *P* ≤0.05. Multiple attempts were made using multivariable analysis to compare the four aerobic culture outcomes for bulk tank milk, but all modeling approaches suffered from over-parametrization even when data was log transformed and were not pursued further.

Independent farm-level predictors from the herd-management questionnaire offered to the multivariable models are described in Table 1. Continuous variables underwent correlation analysis to identify predictor variables that were highly correlated (correlation coefficient ≥0.60), and unconditional associations among categorical variables were evaluated using a Pearson’s chi-squared or Fischer’s Exact test as appropriate (*P* ≤0.05). An ANOVA was used to check for correlation between numeric continuous variables and categorical variables (*P* ≤0.05). When a categorical variable had multiple groups with a small number of observations in each, groups were combined when biologically reasonable to have all categories of predictor variables contain at least five observations. If any predictor had only one observation in a group and there was no way to combine groups in a logical way, it was excluded from further analysis (but listed in descriptive statistic tables, Supplemental Tables S1-S4).

Univariate linear regression was performed in R using the “lme4” package to investigate the unconditional relationship between the six udder health and production outcomes (BTSCC, avg. SCS, newSCS, elevSCS, chronSCS, STD 150-day milk) and two hygiene outcomes (mean hygiene score, proportion of dirty udders) for each farm and the previously-described herd-level independent variables. The two udder hygiene metrics (proportion dirty udders and average udder hygiene score) were used as both predictor variables (in models for other outcome variables) and outcome variables in models of their own. Any explanatory variable that was unconditionally associated with 1 or more of the outcomes of interest at *P* <0.20 was then offered into a multivariable model investigating the relationship between the udder health and production or hygiene outcome and the herd-level predictor variables. If any predictor variables were found to be correlated with each other at the previously described cut-offs, the one with the more highly significant relationship from univariate analysis was offered to the multivariable model when appropriate. The two udder hygiene metrics were highly correlated (derived from the same data), so whichever one had a smaller *P-*value from the univariate analysis was chosen for inclusion in the model-building process. Facility type was forced into these multivariable models, as it was the primary explanatory predictor of interest. A backward stepwise variable selection process was then used, with the least significant variables being removed one by one until all remaining predictors had *P* ≤0.10. Final models were selected based on lowest Akaike information criteria, and an *F-*test to compare the final model to the model with facility type as the only predictor (significance declared at *P* ≤0.05). Overall statistical significance for facility type (the main predictor of interest) was declared at P ≤ 0.05. The multivariable modelling approach described above aimed to investigate the conditional relationship between facility type and the eight outcomes of interest while controlling for different farm management practices, housing characteristics, milking procedures and mastitis control practices.

*Objective 2. Identify other (non-facility) management-related risk factors associated with bulk tank milk quality, udder health, and milk production in organic dairy herds.* After grouping all 21 farms together, we used linear regression in the same manner as described above in Objective 1 to explore associations between the independent predictors described in Table 1 and the six udder health and production outcomes (BTSCC, avg. SCS, newSCS, elevSCS, chronSCS, STD 150-day milk) and two hygiene outcomes (mean hygiene score, proportion of dirty udders). Unconditional relationships between the eight outcome variables and independent predictors are reported for a significance level of *P* ≤0.20 for an F-test, and only for predictor variables with group sizes of at least n = 5.

**Power analysis**

A priori sample size calculations were not performed, as group size was determined by the number of organic dairy herds housing lactating cows on bedded pack systems in our region.

**Results**

**Description of study herds**

Of the 21 herds enrolled, 5 used a bedded pack system, 1 used a FS bedded with sand, 5 used a FS bedded with shavings/sawdust, and 10 used a TS bedded with shavings/sawdust (Supplemental Table S1). The predominant breeds on all farms were Holstein (n = 8 farms), Jersey (n = 10), and mixed Holstein-Jersey crosses/other (n = 3). The median (mean; range) number of lactating cows was 68 (64.9; 32-99). The median annual rolling herd average milk production for the farms was 6,367 (6,424; 4,082-9,618) kg. Nineteen of the 21 farms tested with DHIA monthly while their cows were in milk, 1 farm tested 5-8 times/year, and 1 tested every other month. On average, DHIA data was captured from a test day 4 days before the farm visit (range: -28 days to +33). The average depth of bedding in the 15 freestalls and tiestalls where producers provided an estimate was 4.5 cm (SD: 3.5 cm; range: 1.3-12.7 cm). The average depth of bedded packs (measured by researchers) was 1.3 m (SD: 0.31; range: 0.9-1.7 m). Detailed descriptions further characterizing study farm management practices and housing characteristics for lactating animals (e.g., laying surface, ventilation, stocking density), and details about bedding material and bedding management practices for lactating animals (e.g., bedding depth, frequency of adding new bedding, manure removal) are provided in Supplemental Tables S1 and S2, respectively. Detailed descriptions of routine milking procedures and mastitis control practices are provided in Supplemental Tables S3 and S4, respectively.

**Description of bulk tank milk quality, udder health measures, milk production, and udder hygiene scores**

There was no difference in cfu count between the three facility types for any of the four bacterial groups measured using a nonparametric unconditional comparison (Table 2). None of the 21 bulk tank milk samples were positive for *Strep. agalactiae* or *Mycoplasma* spp. Sixteen of the 21 samples were negative for coliforms on aerobic culture, while 5 farms had a coliform count of 5 cfu/mL. *Staph. aureus* was found in the bulk tank milk from 13/21 herds, with a median (range) cfu/mL of 50 (15-320) when present.

BTSCC, % cows with newly elevated SCS, % cows with chronically elevated SCS, % cows with elevated SCS, avg. SCS, and STD 150-day milk production did not differ by facility type (Table 3).

The overall mean (95% CI) of herd-level udder hygiene scores for all 21 farms was 2.32 (2.16-2.49). The mean hygiene score was 2.2 (1.91-2.44) for bedded pack farms (n = 5), 2.5 (2.24-2.76) for TS farms (n = 10), and 2.15 (1.93-2.37) for FS farms (n = 6). Mean udder hygiene score did not differ by facility type. The overall mean proportion of cows with dirty udders in a herd (udder hygiene score ≥3) was 40% (31-48). The mean proportion of cows with dirty udders (95% CI) was 32% (18-46) for bedded pack farms, 49% (35-62) for TS farms, and 32% (20-44) for FS farms. The proportion of cows with dirty udders did not differ by facility type.

**Objective 1. Analysis of relationship between facility type and measures of bulk tank milk quality, udder health, milk production, and udder hygiene scores**

Final multivariable models are summarized in Table 4. All 21 farms were able to be included in the models for BTSCC, average hygiene score, and proportion of dirty udders. For the models exploring newSCS, chronSCS, and elevSCS, two bedded pack farms did not have available DHIA data (n = 19; group sizes: FS =6, TS = 10, BP = 3). One bedded pack farm did not have average cow-level SCS data (n = 20; group sizes: FS = 6, TS = 10, BP = 4). For STD 150-day milk, one bedded pack farm and two TS farms were missing DHIA data (n = 18; group sizes: FS = 6, TS = 8, BP = 4). Farms with missing data for a particular outcome were excluded for the analyses of that outcome.

*Bulk tank milk quality outcomes*

Variables that were associated at *P* <0.20 with BTSCC in univariate analysis included predominant breed, if herds ever performed culture of mastitic milk, glove use, and herd size. The final multivariable included facility type (forced) and herd size. Facility type was not associated with BTSCC in the final model (Table 4).

*Udder health outcomes*

Herd size category, use of bedding amendment, air quality as assessed by researcher, glove use at milking, and clinical mastitis record keeping practices were offered to a multivariable model for newSCS. The final multivariable model included facility type (forced), bedding amendment use, air quality, glove use, and mastitis record keeping practices. Facility type was not associated with newSCS in the final model (Table 4).

Variables that were associated at *P* <0.20 with chronSCS in univariate analysis included feeding additional supplemental selenium, use of a bedding amendment, clipping/flaming udder hair, and proportion of dirty udders. The final multivariable model included all four variables from univariate analysis, as well as facility type (forced). Facility type was not found to be a significant predictor of the outcome chronSCS (Table 4).

Bedding amendment use and mean hygiene were offered to a multivariable model for elevSCS. Facility type (forced), bedding amendment, and mean hygiene were retained in the final multivariable model. Facility type was not associated with elevSCS in the final model (Table 4).

Feeding additional supplemental selenium, use of bedding amendment, OMRI-listed intramammary product at dry-off, injectable selenium and vitamin E product, and mean hygiene were offered to a multivariable model for herd average SCS. The final multivariable model for avg. SCS included facility type (forced), use of bedding amendment, dry product, injectable selenium, and mean hygiene score. Facility type was not found to be a significant predictor of avg. SCS (Table 4).

*Milk production outcome*

Variables that were associated at *P* <0.20 with STD 150-day milk included use of injectable selenium and vitamin E product, whether producers cultured high SCC cows, and herd size group. All three variables and facility type (forced) remained in the final multivariable model (Table 4). Facility type was not associated with STD 150-day milk in the final model (Table 4).

*Udder hygiene outcomes*

Air quality assessed by researcher was offered to the multivariable model for proportion of dirty udders. The final multivariable model included only facility type (forced), which was not associated with proportion of dirty udders.

Variables that were associated at *P* <0.20 with average hygiene score included whether the producer ever cultured quarter milk samples and whether they checked for cases of clinical mastitis by both examining the udder and forestripping. The final multivariable model included facility type (forced), and how the producer checked for clinical mastitis. Facility type was not associated with the outcome of mean udder hygiene (Table 4).

**Objective 2. Analysis of farm management factors (non-facility) associated with bulk tank milk quality, udder health, milk production, and udder hygiene scores for all farms combined**

Selected results of univariate linear regression models identifying management factors beyond facility type which were unconditionally associated with bulk tank milk quality, udder health, milk production and hygiene outcomes for all farms combined (n = 21) at *P* <0.20 are presented in Table 5. We report the results of these univariate regression models as they may be biologically important, even though many failed to reach threshold for declaring statistical significance at *P* ≤0.05, possibly due to small sample size.

The depth of bedding in stalls for FS and TS herds was unconditionally associated with multiple udder health outcomes. As the depth of bedding in FS and TS herds increased, multiple udder health measures improved, including lower avg. SCS, BTSCC, elevSCS, and newSCS. Similarly, comparing farms where cows were on deep bedding (i.e., grouping all herds reporting deeply-bedded stalls plus bedded pack herds) to herds that had stalls with a smaller amount of bedding on top of a mattress or concrete, farms with deep bedding had a numerically lower BTSCC.

Udder hygiene measures were associated with several udder health outcomes. Higher mean hygiene scores and proportion of udders scored ≥3 were associated with higher chronSCS, elevSCS, and average SCS. A few specific management practices were also found to be unconditionally associated with udder health outcomes: consistent glove use was associated with lower newSCS and BTSCC, clipping or flaming udders was associated with fewer chronSCS, and both parenteral supplementation of vit. E/selenium and use of an OMRI-listed intramammary product at dry-off were associated with lower average SCS and higher STD 150-day milk.

Both udder hygiene outcomes were unconditionally associated with the same predictors, most of which were related to the depth of bedding for cows. For the five herds using a bedded pack, deeper bedding was associated with lower average hygiene scores and lower proportion of dirty udders. Farms with cows housed on some type of deep bedding (i.e., grouping the three freestalls and tiestalls reporting deeply-bedded stalls, plus the five bedded pack herds) had numerically lower average udder hygiene scores and proportion dirty udders compared to cows on stalls with bedding over a mattress or concrete surface. For the fifteen tiestalls and freestalls reporting bedding depth in stalls increased bedding depth was associated with lower mean udder hygiene score and a numerically lower proportion of dirty udders.

**Discussion**

This work presents the results of our observational study exploring the relationship between facility type and udder health and hygiene metrics, BTM quality (SCC and microbiology), and milk production on organic dairy farms in Vermont. The current study is to the authors’ knowledge the first direct comparison of milk quality, udder health and udder hygiene on bedded pack farms to both TS and FS herds of similar size and management styles, for a population of entirely small to midsize organic dairy farms. The major objective was to identify if milk quality, udder health and hygiene outcomes were associated with facility type, thereby exploring if bedded pack systems are a viable option for housing in Vermont during the non-grazing season compared to the two most common indoor housing systems in the state (FS, TS). This study is also the first to describe udder health and hygiene on BP in the Northeastern US, which is significant as the performance of these systems can be greatly influenced by climatic factors. As BTM bacteriology, udder health and hygiene metrics, and milk yield did not differ for BP herds compared to TS and FS herds, there was insufficient evidence to reject our hypothesis that these metrics would vary by facility type. We conclude that bedded pack systems can be considered a viable loose-housing option for organic dairy cattle during the non-grazing season in the Northeastern US.

**Objective 1: Comparison of bulk tank milk quality, udder health, milk production, and udder hygiene measures by facility type**

Previous work describing bulk tank milk aerobic culture data for farms using a bedded pack system has primarily been limited to descriptive studies enrolling only compost bedded-pack herds (Barberg et al., 2007b; Shane et al., 2010), with only one study directly comparing bacterial counts between CBP and FS barns (Lobeck et al., 2012). The six farms included in Lobeck et al. (2012) used mainly wood sawdust as bedding material (with one using wheat straw by‐product) as did the 12 farms in Barberg et al. (2007). This is similar to the current study, where three of five BP used a combination of woodchips/shavings and straw/hay, and two used exclusively sawdust/shavings. The six farms included in Shane et al. (2010) bedded with a variety of “alternative” organic materials, including straw by-products, soybean stubble, and oat hulls. In contrast to previous work, which evaluated milk culture results across the summer months (Barberg et al., 2007b) and year-round (Lobeck et al., 2012), the current study focused solely on sampling during the period when animals are primarily housed inside in Vermont. We were most interested in studying bulk tank milk bacteriology for these organic herds during the non-grazing season, as this is when these pastured-based farms need to house their animals inside. All herds included had excellent bulk tank milk quality; most (19/21) fell into the “low BTSCC” category as defined by Jayarao et al. 2004 with the remaining 2 in the “medium BTSCC” category.

The *Staph.* spp. count for the five bedded pack farms included in this study (median: 40 cfu/mL, range: 0-130) was comparable to previous work describing bulk tank milk quality for CBP in Minnesota during the winter months. Lobeck et al. 2012 found a mean of 26.1 cfu/mL (95% CI: 2-443) and Shane et al. (2010) found a range of 0-108 cfu/mL for *Staph.* spp. from BTM collected just over the winter months from six CBP farms. “*Staph.* spp.” is comprised of a diverse group of different species, with 23 (Condas et al., 2017) or 25 (De Visscher et al., 2017) different species isolated from intramammary infections in dairy cattle. Within this highly heterogenous group, some species are considered primarily host-adapted (colonizing the skin or udder), while others are primarily found in the cow’s environment (reviewed in De Buck et al., 2021). Certain species have been associated with stall surfaces, air, and unused sawdust bedding material (Piessens et al., 2011), some with different facility types (Condas et al., 2017), and others with environmental contamination and poor teat hygiene at milking time (De Visscher et al., 2016; De Visscher et al., 2017). Although the specific source and routes of transmission for many *Staph.* spp. are still being elucidated, the importance of post-milking teat-dip to control this group of bacteria has been established (Hogan et al., 1987), while the efficacy of pre-dipping to control *Staph*. spp. other than *S. aureus* remains controversial (Pankey, 1989). In general, the use of pre- and post- milking teat dip decreases contamination of bulk tank milk both by commensal skin organisms and environmental contamination at milking time (Pankey et al., 1985; Pankey et al., 1987; Quirk et al., 2012). All but one farm in the current study would fall into the “low” category for *Staph.* spp. counts in the BTM (Jayarao et al., 2004), which is consistent with all 21 herds using both pre- and post-dip consistently at milking time.

Streptococci and strep-like organisms (SSLO) counts in BTM for BP in the current study were much lower than those from Minnesota CBP in the winter. Shane et al. 2010 reported a range ofSSLOcounts of 98-48,400 cfu/mL for six farms, and Lobeck et al. 2012 reported a mean of 911 cfu/mL (95% CI: 138-6,011). The median SSLO counts for bedded pack farms included in the current study was 35 cfu/mL (range: 10-80). Work from Barberg et al. (2007) describing milk quality on CBP in Minnesota noted that 6 of 12 farms sampled had “high” levels of SSLO. SSLO count did not differ between TS, FS, and BP in the current study. The overall SSLO count for all 21 farms included in the current study (median: 45 cfu/mL, range: 10-1250) was lower than that for the overall *Strep.* count for all three facility types studied in Lobeck et al. 2012 (445 cfu/mL, 95% CI: 116-1704). As the overall SSLO counts for all farm types included in the Minnesota studies are higher than that found for all 21 farms in the current study, better milking and bedding hygiene amongst herds included in the current study may best explain this difference in BTM pathogen profiles (Jayarao and Wolfgang, 2003).

All farms had low levels of coliforms in bulk tank milk (median: 0 cfu/mL, range: 0-5), indicating excellent hygiene practices at milking time (Jayarao and Wolfgang, 2003). Coliform counts did not differ between the three facility types. Bedded pack farms in the current study had very low coliform counts in BTM (median: 0 cfu/mL, range: 0-5), similar to those found for three CBP farms in a Brazilian study (2.8 cfu/mL; Fávero et al. 2015). These low coliform counts are in contrast with previous work describing BTM quality for this kind of facility in the United States. Coliform counts for BP in Minnesota in the winter ranged from 15-1,128 cfu/mL (Shane et al., 2010), and the six BP included in Lobeck et al. 2012. had a mean of 63.7 cfu/mL (95% CI: 6-735). However, direct comparison of coliform counts between studies may be potentially problematic due to variation in duration of freezer storage (Schukken et al., 1989). Although sampled during summer months, Barberg et al. 2007 found that 5 of 12 BP sampled had “high” levels of coliforms in BTM, contributing to their conclusion that “special attention to cow preparation procedures at milking time are a must for achieving satisfactory milk quality when cows are housed in compost dairy barns.”

Prevalence of *Staph. aureus* was similar between the five VT bedded pack farms in the current study (median: 0 cfu/mL, range: 0-30) and the six BP described in Lobeck et al. 2012 (6.2 cfu/mL, 95% CI: 1.3-30.1). Farm-level prevalence of *Staph. aureus* was also fairly low for BP studied in Shane et al. 2010 (3 of 6 farms BTM negative) and Barberg et al. 2007 (only 1 of 12 farms with a “high” level of *Staph. aureus*). Overall, the population of all 21 farms in the current study had a higher amount of *Staph. aureus* in BTM than the 18 Minnesota farms described in Shane et al. 2010 (median: 30 cfu/mL, range: 0-320; vs. 17.3 cfu/mL, 95% CI: 3.3-91.2). Although it is not clear how many herds included in previous work on BP were certified organic, the higher prevalence of *Staph. aureus* amongst organic farms in the current study is consistent with work comparing organic and conventional dairy systems (Pol and Ruegg, 2007).

Analysis of a single bulk tank milk sample from a farm is a simple, convenient, and relatively inexpensive way to capture a snapshot of current milk quality and animal health on a farm, and can be a highly specific (albeit poorly sensitive) screening test for major contagious mastitis pathogens (*Staph. aureus* and *Strep. agalactiae;* Godkin and Leslie 1993. Our bulk tank sampling strategy (collecting a single sample) differed from previous work describing the bacteriology of milk from bedded pack farms, where four or five consecutive bulk tank milk pickups were collected and then pooled for analysis (Barberg et al., 2007b; Shane et al., 2010; Lobeck et al., 2012). We acknowledge that analysis of a single BTM sample in the current study comes with limitations. Bacterial groups traditionally considered to be primarily environmental in origin (non-*ag. Strep., Staph* spp*.,* coliforms), may enter BTM from cows with an intramammary infection, but also may originate from non-specific contamination (teat and udder skin, bedding, manure, or other environmental sources; Elmoslemany et al., 2009. Furthermore, a single bulk tank sample does not give insight into long-term, consistent patterns of a particular farm’s milk quality as is possible from repeated BTM samplings (Jayarao and Wolfgang, 2003). With the financial constraints of research on commercial dairy farms, the limitations inherent in performing analysis of a single bulk tank milk sample from each farm were a trade-off for the ability to get a picture of milk quality on a larger number of farms included in the study.

Udder health outcomes included in the current study (percent cows with elevSCS, percent cows with chronSCS, percent cows with newSCS, BTSCC, and average SCS) did not differ significantly between facility types. Although some previous work has found BTSCC to be elevated for CBP farms (425,000 cells/mL over all four seasons, Black et. al 2013; 325,000 cells/mL during summer, Barberg et. al 2007b), other groups have also found udder health and milk quality measures on bedded pack farms are similar to farms using more traditional facility types. Specifically, subclinical mastitis prevalence levels did not differ between CBP and two types of FS housing in Minnesota and South Dakota, where the percent of cows in a herd with an SCC on test day ≥200,000 cells/mL was 33.4, 26.8, and 26.8% for CBP, cross-ventilated FS, and naturally-vented FS (Lobeck et al., 2011). Eckelkamp et. al 2016a ound no significant difference in subclinical mastitis prevalence in CBP vs. sand-bedded FS in Kentucky with a history of low BTSCC (21.8 and 19.4%, respectively), as well as no difference in BTSCC between the two facility types (229,582 and 205,131 cells/mL, respectively). Subclinical mastitis prevalence was 27.7% for 12 CBP farms in Minnesota (Barberg et. al 2007b) which may be more representative of the general population of bedded pack farms in that state as there were no inclusion criteria around maintaining a low SCC previous to the start of the study. The prevalence of subclinical mastitis for herds in the current study (26% for BP) is similar to previous work in the US. In contrast, Fávero et. al (2015) found a much higher prevalence of subclinical mastitis (43.8%) and percent new infections (20.9%) for three bedded pack farms in Brazil than our study (26 and 7% respectively, for the three BP with available data).

STD 150-day milk production did not differ between facility type in the current study. This aligns with previous research which found no significant differences in various production metrics of cows housed on BP vs. in FS barns (Lobeck et al., 2011; Eckelkamp et al., 2016a; Costa et al., 2018). Varying production metrics for cows housed on BP have been reported previously (kg/cow/day, fat-corrected milk/cow/day, average L/cow/day, ME-305, rolling herd average, energy-corrected milk), preventing direct comparisons of milk production between the BP in the current study and other work. Additionally, many variables play a role in determining milk production (nutrition, breed, seasonality, DIM), so teasing out the effect of facility type alone on production in an observational study is difficult. However, as Leso et. al (2020) oint out, the “results in the literature indicate that high levels of milk production are possible in CBP.” As BP potentially improve cow comfort, one may even expect greater milk production than in more traditional housing systems (Calamari et al., 2009; Ruud et al., 2010).

Our finding no difference in the two udder hygiene measures between the three facility types is in accordance with previous work, which found that cow hygiene on bedded pack systems was comparable to traditional facility types in the Upper Midwestern U.S., Southeastern U.S., and Brazil (Barberg et al., 2007b; Shane et al., 2010; Black et al., 2013; Eckelkamp et al., 2016b; a; Costa et al., 2018; Adkins et al., 2022; Andrade et al., 2022). Black (2013) and Eckelkamp (2016a) reported that increased pack moisture allows wet bedding material and manure to adhere more easily to animals, meaning that cow hygiene is highly dependent on conditions of the bedded pack. This sentiment was echoed by the bedded pack producers in the current study, who shared that keeping their cows clean during periods of wet or humid weather could be a challenge. However, all BP in the current study had an average udder hygiene score of less than 2.5, and the farm with the lowest mean average udder hygiene score overall was a bedded pack farm. Although Cook (2002) as pointed out the challenges of comparing dairy cattle hygiene between different facility types, we chose to focus on gathering observations of udder hygiene. The relationship between udder hygiene and health is well-studied, and was a tractable observation to make during non-grazing season farm visits where individual animals were often roaming freely in a pen, or confined in a TS barn.

**Objective 2: Analysis of farm management factors (non-facility) associated with bulk tank milk quality, udder health, milk production, and udder hygiene scores for all farms combined**

As results from the multivariable models exploring the relationship between facility type and outcomes of interest suffered from limited statistical power due to small sample sizes, the focus of the discussion will be on trends that emerged from the univariate analysis which combined all 21 farms.

One finding emerging from this work is that farms with deeper bedding had more favorable udder hygiene metrics (deeper bedding begets cleaner cows). When comparing farms that housed cows with a deep bedding system (deeply-bedded stalls or a bedded pack) to those that housed cows on stalls with a smaller amount of bedding (over a mattress or concrete surface), the deeply-bedded systems tended to have better hygiene scores. This agrees with previous observational field studies of FS barns, including: Cook et al. 2016 prevalence of dirty udders was 13% lower for farms using deep bedding vs. stalls with mats), de Vries et al. 2015 deep-bedding vs. mat/mattress reduced the likelihood of a cow having a dirty hindquarter by half), and Robles et al. 2020 farms with mattress-based stalls had a higher prevalence of cows with dirty upper legs/flanks vs. those using a deep bedding system, often inorganic sand). In contrast, an experimental study looking at the effect of bedding depth in TS over 28-day periods found no difference between leg, flank, and udder hygiene of cows using deeply-bedded stalls (14 cm) and the control treatment (2-3 cm; Wolfe et al., 2018.

Beyond comparing udder hygiene of cows housed on a deep-bedding system to cows that were not, there was a linear association between bedding depth (depth of bedded pack, depth of bedding in FS and TS) and hygiene score. As the measured height of bedding got deeper (height of bedded pack, or amount of bedding material in stall), cows tended to have cleaner udders. To the best of our knowledge, work exploring this direct relationship between measured bedding depth and hygiene is limited to a single study by de Vries et al. 2015, who found no relationship between prevalence of dirty hindquarters and three different FS bedding height groups (<0.56 cm, 0.56–1.75 cm, >1.75 cm). In our study, this relationship between bedding depth and udder hygiene was especially strong for BP, despite the limited sample size of five herds. To the best of our knowledge, this specific association has not previously been explored for bedded pack herds. There is clearly opportunity for future research looking at this relationship between increased amount of bedding used in deep-bedded systems (or more deeply-bedded stalls) and the benefit of improved udder hygiene and milk quality.

Multiple measures of udder health in this study were associated with udder hygiene, in accordance with the well-supported tenet that better cow hygiene is associated with better milk quality (cleaner cows beget better milk). The association between hygiene and udder health has been well-documented, both at the cow level (for IMI presence: de Pinho et al. 2012; for SCS/SCC: Reneau et al. 2005, Dohmen et al. 2010, and Sant’anna et al. 2011; for both SCS and IMI: Schreiner and Ruegg, 2003) and at the herd-level (BTSCC: Barkema et al. 1998; new IMI rate: Cook et al. 2002; average herd SCC, incidence clinical mastitis, and % new high SCC: Dohmen et al. 2010). Of particular relevance to the current work, a study carried out on three bedded pack farms in Brazil found the odds of a new case of subclinical mastitis (SCC ≥200,000 cells/mL) and of a cow having subclinical mastitis on test day increased 32% and 16% for each one-unit increase in leg cleanliness score, respectively (Fávero et al., 2015). Curiously, although leg cleanliness score was associated with both mastitis outcomes on Brazilian BP, udder hygiene score was not.

A third interesting finding to emerge from the univariate regression results is that farms using deeper bedding had better milk quality outcomes (deeper bedding begets better milk). Although there is an established recommendation of 15 cm for deep bedding of FS (Bickert, 2000; Cook, 2002) this depth appears to be based on optimizing cow comfort in deep-bedded FS with no reference to udder hygiene or health. There is very limited work exploring ideal bedding material depth for TS barns (Tucker and Weary, 2004; Tucker et al., 2009), and this is again solely focused on the important concern of cow comfort. As is the experience of the authors, and is stated elsewhere in a literature review by McPherson (2020), "very little research has investigated the effect of bedding depth on cow cleanliness” or considerations around udder health outcomes. It is likely that the effect seen in the current work of deeper bedding and better udder health outcomes is mediated through the presumed causal pathway of (1) deeper bedding leading to improved hygiene, and (2) improved hygiene resulting in better udder health. Even still, the opportunity exists for research exploring optimal stall bedding depths of different organic materials in TS barns with a focus on mastitis and udder health outcomes. It may be that recommending a particular depth of bedding to use for different types of organic material would not prove feasible, as the ideal amount would vary with many factors particular to a producer’s barn and bedding source (type of stall surface, presence/type of stall mat used, type of organic material, particle size, compressibility, percent dry matter, etc.).

While bedded pack systems are not common for housing lactating cows in Vermont (Andrews et al., 2021), farms using a bedded pack system in Vermont are using both compost bedded-packs managed with daily cultivation, and conventional, untilled deep bedded pack systems. The relatively small number of bedded packs being used in our state to house lactating dairy cattle created a challenge for enrolling ten herds using this kind of system in our observational study. As untilled and cultivated bedded pack systems differ in numerous regards (Leso et al., 2020), ideally we would have been able to enroll enough farms using each type and treat them as separate groups in the analysis. Due to the limited sample size available using these systems in the state, it was necessary to combine both types of system in order to achieve our objective of describing udder hygiene, milk quality, and udder health on these loose-housing systems deeply-bedded with organic material in the state. While we acknowledge that grouping them together is not ideal, this diversity is a reflection of how the target population (small-medium, pasture-based organic dairy farms) are actually using this system in the Northeastern U.S. (Benson, 2012). Despite this limitation, by including bedded pack farms managed in a variety of ways, our aim was that the current work sheds light on a broader spectrum of options used within this loose-housing system. Our current study shows that farms can achieve excellent milk quality using either an untilled, deep bedded pack system or an aerobically composting bedded pack system for indoor housing; three of the five bedded pack farms had a BTSCC ≤99,000 cells/mL, and the remaining two were ≤160,000 cells/mL. Furthermore, the lowest BTSCC in the study (54,000 cells/mL) was a static bedded pack farm using woodchips and straw. This low BTSCC was not just from selectively dumping milk from high-SCC cows; this farm also had the lowest overall % cows with elevated SCS (8.6%; data not shown).

As for any observational study, there is the potential for bias to have influenced the observed results. Most importantly, participating herds were not a random sample of organic farms in the state, possibly resulting in selection bias. Participating herds were a convenience sample of a subset who responded to our initial survey in Winter 2018-2019 (source population). In 2021, there were 147 organic dairy farms in Vermont selling milk, with an average herd size of 87 cows making 6,627 kg milk/cow/year (USDA, 2022). Herds in the current study were slightly smaller, averaging 65 cows per farm, but with higher-producing cows (7,828 kg milk/cow/year, estimated from captured DHIA records). For comparison, the average dairy cow in the U.S. produced an average of 10,926 kg of milk in 2022 (Progressive Dairy, 2017). It may be interesting to acknowledge here that organic cows on average produce less milk (Stiglbauer et al., 2013), and with decreased milk production comes decreased susceptibility to mastitis (Grohn, 2000). This relationship may in part explain the relatively low prevalence of mastitis occurring on these farms in comparison to the general population of conventionally-managed dairy farms. The potential exists that producers who volunteered to participate in the current study are systematically more progressive or somehow different in their management practices than the general population of organic farms in Vermont. Additionally, cross-sectional studies are unable to demonstrate causality for associations presented between management practices and outcomes. However, these limitations are inherent to every observational study, and all attempts were made to control for potential confounding with the multivariable models presented.

One limitation of the current study is the small number of farms in each facility type. As state agencies had been promoting the use of bedded pack systems for years in Vermont, we had anticipated it would be feasible to enroll 10 farms using this system to house their lactating animals. This turned out not to be the case; the Winter 2018-2019 survey showed that many dairy farms were instead using these systems for non-lactating animals (heifers, dry cows; Andrews et al. 2021). Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic precluded resumption of the study in Spring 2020, limiting the number of farms included to herds sampled in 2019, and not all farms had DHIA data for every outcome of interest. A related limitation is that well-established mastitis control practices (i.e., teat-dipping, forestripping, using separate towels for individual cows) were widely adapted by participating herds, so we were unable to analyze associations between certain practices and BTM quality, udder health, and hygiene. A large body of work exists showing consistent udder health benefits from using these and other practices, so lack of association between these fundamental mastitis control practices and desirable outcomes in the current study should not be taken as evidence that they provide no benefit. The potential exists for future studies with a larger number of farms enrolled to further characterize milk quality and udder health on bedded pack systems in the Northeastern US. Studies enrolling a larger number of bedded pack farms by covering a larger geographic area may have sufficient power to identify particular management factors which are beneficial on BP specifically.

Bedded pack systems have a number of advantages for producers considering updating their facilities, including a smaller initial investment when compared to a new FS or TS barn (Barberg et al., 2007a; Janni et al., 2007; Black et al., 2013), although the cost year-over-year for bedding is substantial (Shane et al., 2010). Bedded packs are designed for cow comfort (Barberg et al., 2007b; Bewley et al., 2012), and prevalence of lameness, foot, and leg injuries in these systems has been found to be less than TS and FS barns (Barberg et al., 2007b; Lobeck et al., 2011; Burgstaller et al., 2016). Lastly, manure management and environmental stewardship is a top concern for both dairy producers and the general public (Holly et al., 2018). Anecdotally, the five BP producers enrolled in the study were pleased with their systems of manure management, viewing their used bedding material and manure as a valuable soil amendment and an integral part of their nutrient management plan. Bedded pack systems decrease the amount of liquid manure waste when compared to conventional barns, and the used bedding with manure is more easily composted before use as a soil amendment. As composted bedded pack material is drier before it is spread on fields, it poses less of a risk for run-off into waterways, increases soil infiltration of nutrients, and creates flexibility around timing of manure application to fields (Rushmann). With no obvious disadvantages for udder health or hygiene when properly managed on farms with excellent milking hygiene practices already in place, BP may be an especially good housing option for small, pasture-based farms in the Northeastern US.

**Conclusion**

Bedded pack systems did not differ significantly in their milk quality, udder health, udder hygiene measures, or milk production, as compared to the more commonly used indoor housing systems (FS or TS) for organic cows in Vermont. Bedded packs can therefore be considered as a viable option for pasture-based herds looking for a loose-housing system. Findings from the secondary analysis of results found evidence of the well-supported tenets that better cow hygiene is associated with better milk quality, and farms with deeper bedding had more favorable udder hygiene metrics. Additionally, farms using deeper bedding had better milk quality outcomes, which may likely be mediated through improved hygiene resulting in better udder health outcomes.
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**Tables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1. Predictors offered to multivariable models for each of the eight different outcomes of interest along with facility type (forced) | | | |
| Predictor | | | Level of parameter, if categorical: |
| Farm demographics/lactating cow housing | | |  |
|  | Facility type | | Bedded pack; Freestall; Tiestall |
|  | Predominant breed | | Holstein; Jersey/Other |
|  | Herd size (lactating cows) | |  |
|  | Herd size group (lactating cows) | | 30-55; 56-69; 70-100 |
|  | Subjective assessment of air quality (producer) | | Excellent; Good; Fair/Poor |
|  | Subjective assessment of air quality (researcher) | | Good; Fair |
|  | Age of facility (years) | |  |
|  | Feed supplemental vit. E and selenium | | Yes; No |
| Lactating bedding management practices | | |  |
|  | Lying surface for cows1 (deeply-bedded vs. not) | | Deeply-bedded stalls or bedded pack; Stalls with bedding on a mattress or concrete surface |
|  | *If use shavings/sawdust/woodchips for bedding material:* | |  |
|  |  | Moisture-content | Kiln-dried; Fresh/raw |
|  | Bedding amendment (e.g., hydrated lime) used on surface | | Yes; No |
|  | *If facility is freestall or tiestall:* | |  |
|  |  | Freq. adding new bedding to stalls (times per week) |  |
|  |  | Freq. scraping stalls (times per week) |  |
|  |  | Depth bedding in stalls (cm) |  |
| Mastitis control and milking hygiene practices | | |  |
|  | Clip/flame udder hair | | Yes; No |
|  | Keep record of clinical mastitis events | | Always; Sometimes/Temp.; Never |
|  | Routinely culture mastitic milk | | Always/Sometimes; Never |
|  | Routinely culture high somatic cell count cows | | Always/Sometimes; Never |
|  | Ever perform culture of mastitic cows | | Yes; Never culture |
|  | Use intramammary product at dry-off (OMRI-listed) | | Yes; No |
|  | Parenteral supplementation with vit. E and selenium | | All lactating cows regularly/ Occasionally as needed; No |
|  | Glove use at milking | | All milkers consistently; Inconsistently/No |
|  | Check for clinical mastitis by noticing abnormal cow/abnormal udder and forestripping | | Yes; No |
|  | Type of milking system used3 | | Parlor; Tiestall |
| Farm-level udder hygiene metrics | | |  |
|  | Average udder hygiene score | |  |
|  | Prop. dirty udders (%; udder hygiene score ≥3) | |  |
| 1 If freestall or tiestall, producer asked if used deeply-bedded stalls | | | |
| 2 OMRI: Organic Materials Review Institute | | | |
| 3 One freestall farm used an automated milking system | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2. Objective 1: Descriptive and univariable results for bulk tank milk aerobic culture outcomes by facility type [median (range)]. *P-*value is for Kruskal-Wallis test by facility type grouping | | | | | |
| Bacteria group (cfu/mL) | Overall (n = 21) | Bedded packs (n = 5) | Tiestalls (n = 10) | Freestalls (n = 6) | *P-*value |
| *Staph.* spp. | 65 (0-665) | 40 (0-130) | 85 (15-665) | 67.5 (5-125) | 0.62 |
| *Strep.* and strep-like orgs. | 45 (10-1250) | 35 (10-80) | 167.5 (20-1250) | 32.5 (25-260) | 0.10 |
| *Staph. aureus* | 30 (0-320) | 0 (0-30) | 47.5 (0-320) | 42.5 (0-100) | 0.19 |
| Coliforms | 0 (0-5) | 0 (0-5) | 0 (0-5) | 0 (0-5) | 0.82 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3. Objective 1: Descriptive results for milk quality, udder health and production outcomes by facility type [mean (95%CI)] | | | | |
| Outcome | Overall | Bedded packs | Tiestalls | Freestalls |
| BTSCC (log10cells/mL) | n = 21 | n = 5 | n = 10 | n = 6 |
|  | 5.13 (5.06-5.20) | 5.00 (4.84-5.17) | 5.14 (5.05-5.23) | 5.21 (5.09-5.33) |
| % newly elevated SCS1 | n = 19 | n = 3 | n = 10 | n = 6 |
|  | 5.7 (4.2-7.3) | 7.0 (2.8-11.2) | 5.4 (3.0-7.8) | 5.6 (3.0-8.3) |
| % chronically elevated SCS1 | n = 19 | n = 3 | n = 10 | n = 6 |
|  | 13.6 (11.2-16.1) | 14.5 (5.4-23.7) | 14.3 (11.9-16.7) | 12.0 (6.7-17.3) |
| % SCS ≥ 4.0 current test1 | n = 19 | n = 3 | n = 10 | n = 6 |
|  | 24.9 (21.6-28.3) | 26.0 (12.6-39.3) | 25.4 (22.1-28.6) | 23.7 (16.9-30.5) |
| Avg. SCS2 | n = 20 | n = 4 | n = 10 | n = 6 |
|  | 2.44 (2.26-2.62) | 2.38 (1.84-2.91) | 2.45 (2.31-2.59) | 2.50 (2.00-2.93) |
| Standardized 150-day milk (pounds)3 | n = 18 | n = 4 | n = 8 | n = 6 |
|  | 50.0 (45.7-54.3) | 46.9 (39.8-53.9) | 49.4 (43.1-55.7) | 53.0 (43.5-62.5) |
| 1 DHIA data not available for 2 bedded pack farms | | | | |
| 2 DHIA data not available for 1 bedded pack farm | | | | |
| 3 DHIA data not available for 1 bedded pack farms and 2 tiestall farms | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 4. Objective 1: Final multivariable models describing the relationship between facility type (forced) and milk quality, udder health, production, and udder hygiene outcomes | | | | |
| Outcome | Explanatory variable | Group (sample size) | Coefficient estimate (SE) | *P-*value |
| BTSCC (log10cells/mL) | |  |  |  |
|  | Intercept |  | 4.8 (0.15) |  |
|  | Facility type (forced) | Freestall (n = 6) | 0.19 (0.09) | 0.05 |
|  |  | Tiestall (n = 10) | 0.16 (0.08) | 0.07 |
|  |  | Bedded pack (n = 5) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Herd size | All herds (n = 21) | 0.003 (0.002) | 0.15 |
| % newly elevated SCS | |  |  |  |
|  | Intercept |  | -1.6 (2.5) |  |
|  | Facility type (forced) | Freestall (n = 6) | 2.3 (2.2) | 0.33 |
|  |  | Tiestall (n = 10) | 0.43 (1.9) | 0.82 |
|  |  | Bedded pack (n = 3) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Use bedding amendment | Yes (n = 5) | 3.9 (1.8) | 0.05 |
|  |  | No (n = 14) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Subjective assessment air quality (researcher) | Good (n = 14) | 3.6 (1.5) | 0.04 |
|  |  | Fair (n = 5) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Glove use at milking1 | Never/Inconsistently (n = 9) | 2.0 (1.3) | 0.17 |
|  |  | Always (n = 9) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Clinical mastitis events record keeping | Never kept records (n = 6) | 4.4 (1.8) | 0.03 |
|  |  | Sometimes/Temporarily kept records (n = 6) | 1.1 (1.6) | 0.52 |
|  |  | Always kept records (n = 7) | Ref. | Ref. |
| % chronically elevated SCS | |  |  |  |
|  | Intercept |  | 5.3 (3.6) |  |
|  | Facility type (forced) | Freestall (n = 6) | 1.5 (4.6) | 0.75 |
|  |  | Tiestall (n = 10) | -0.08 (3.5) | 0.98 |
|  |  | Bedded pack (n = 3) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Feed supplemental vit. E and selenium2 | Yes (n = 11) | 2.1 (2.8) | 0.48 |
|  |  | No (n = 7) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Use bedding amendment | Yes (n = 5) | 5.7 (3.4) | 0.12 |
|  |  | No (n = 14) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Clip/flame udder hair | Yes (n = 5) | -6.3 (3.1) | 0.07 |
|  |  | No (n = 14) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | % udder hygiene scores ≥3 | Herds with available data (n = 19) | 17.0 (6.1) | 0.02 |
| % SCS ≥ 4.0 current test | |  |  |  |
|  | Intercept |  | 0.85 (10.6) |  |
|  | Facility type (forced) | Freestall (n = 6) | 1.8 (5.7) | 0.75 |
|  |  | Tiestall (n = 10) | -2.4 (5.3) | 0.66 |
|  |  | Bedded pack (n = 3) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Use bedding amendment | Yes (n = 5) | 8.0 (4.2) | 0.07 |
|  |  | No (n = 14) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Mean hygiene | Herds with available data (n = 19) | 9.8 (4.7) | 0.06 |
| Avg. SCS | |  |  | 20 |
|  | Intercept |  | 0.93 (0.44) |  |
|  | Facility type (forced) | Freestall (n = 6) | 0.38 (0.21) | 0.09 |
|  |  | Tiestall (n = 10) | 0.03 (0.19) | 0.86 |
|  |  | Bedded pack (n = 4) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Use intramammary product at dry-off (OMRI-listed) | Yes (n = 5) | -0.30 (0.16) | 0.08 |
|  |  | No (n = 15) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Use bedding amendment | Yes (n = 5) | 0.52 (0.16) | 0.007 |
|  |  | No (n = 15) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Parenteral supplementation vit. E/selenium | Regularly or occasionally (n = 9) | -0.36 (0.14) | 0.02 |
|  |  | No supplementation (n = 11) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Mean hygiene | Herds with available data (n = 20) | 0.64 (0.19) | 0.005 |
| Standardized 150-day milk (pounds) | |  |  | 18 |
|  | Intercept |  | 41.2 (6.1) |  |
|  | Facility type (forced) | Freestall (n = 6) | -0.06 (7.0) | 0.99 |
|  |  | Tiestall (n = 8) | -1.7 (6.6) | 0.80 |
|  |  | Bedded pack (n = 4) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Parenteral supplementation vit. E/selenium | Regularly or occasionally (n = 7) | 7.0 (5.2) | 0.20 |
|  |  | No supplementation (n = 11) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Culture high SCC cows | Always/Sometimes (n = 8) | 9.3 (5.9) | 0.14 |
|  |  | Never (n = 10) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Herd size grp. (lact. cows) | 70-100 (n = 8) | -0.18 (7.3) | 0.98 |
|  |  | 56-69 (n = 5) | 10.3 (6.2) | 0.12 |
|  |  | 30-55 (n = 5) | Ref. | Ref. |
| % udder hygiene scores ≥3 | |  |  |  |
|  | Intercept |  | 0.32 (0.08) |  |
|  | Facility type (forced) | Freestall (n = 6) | 0.002 (0.11) | 0.99 |
|  |  | Tiestall (n = 10) | 0.17 (0.10) | 0.12 |
|  |  | Bedded pack (n = 5) | Ref. | Ref. |
| Avg. udder hygiene score | |  |  |  |
|  | Intercept |  | 2.3 (0.17) |  |
|  | Facility type (forced) | Freestall (n = 6) | -0.04 (0.21) | 0.84 |
|  |  | Tiestall (n = 10) | 0.33 (0.19) | 0.11 |
|  |  | Bedded pack (n = 5) | Ref. | Ref. |
|  | Check for clinical mastitis by noticing abnormal cow/abnormal udder and forestripping | Yes (n = 8) | -0.25 (0.16) | 0.14 |
|  |  | No (n = 13) | Ref. | Ref. |
| 1 One farm used automatic milking system | | | | |
| 2 One farm unable to provide response | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 5. Objective 2: Selected models of univariate analysis identifying (non-facility type) factors unconditionally associated with milk quality, udder health, production, and udder hygiene outcomes at *P* <0.20 | | | | | |
| Outcome | Explanatory Variable | Group (sample size) | Coefficient estimate (SE) | *P-*value | Intercept |
| BTSCC (log10cells/mL) | |  |  |  |  |
| Model 1 | Lying surface | Mattress or concrete (n = 13) | 0.12 (0.07) | 0.12 | 5.1 |
|  |  | Deep bedding (n = 8) | Ref. | Ref. |  |
| Model 2 | Depth of bedding in stalls (cm)1 | Tiestalls and freestalls (n = 15) | -0.02 (0.01) | 0.11 | 5.2 |
| Model 3 | Glove use at milking2 | Never/Inconsistently (n = 9) | 0.10 (0.07) | 0.19 | 5.1 |
|  |  | Always (n = 11) | Ref. | Ref. |  |
| % newly elevated SCS3 | |  |  |  |  |
| Model 4 | Glove use at milking | Never/Inconsistently (n = 9) | 2.83 (1.7) | 0.11 | 4.3 |
|  |  | Always (n = 9) | Ref. | Ref. |  |
| Model 5 | Depth of bedding in stalls (cm)1 | Tiestalls and freestalls (n = 15) | -0.62 (0.24) | 0.02 | 8.3 |
| % chronically elevated SCS3 | |  |  |  |  |
| Model 6 | Clip/flame udder hair | Yes (n = 5) | -4.31 (2.9) | 0.16 | 14.8 |
|  |  | No (n = 14) | Ref. | Ref. |  |
| Model 7 | % udder hygiene scores ≥3 | Herds with available data (n = 19) | 12.7 (6.1) | 0.05 | 8.6 |
| Model 8 | Avg. udder hygiene score | Herds with available data (n = 19) | 6.39 (3.1) | 0.05 | -1.2 |
| % SCS ≥ 4.0 current test3 | |  |  |  |  |
| Model 9 | Depth of bedding in stalls (cm)1 | Tiestalls and freestalls (n = 15) | -1.2 (0.42) | 0.01 | 30 |
| Model 10 | % udder hygiene scores ≥3 | Herds with available data (n = 19) | 13.6 (8.5) | 0.13 | 19.6 |
| Model 11 | Avg. udder hygiene score | Herds with available data (n = 19) | 7.7 (4.3) | 0.09 | 7.1 |
| Average SCS4 | |  |  |  |  |
| Model 12 | Parenteral supplementation vit. E and selenium | Regularly or occasionally (n = 9) | -0.27 (0.18) | 0.15 | 2.6 |
|  |  | No supplementation (n = 11) | Ref. | Ref. |  |
| Model 13 | Use intramammary product at dry-off (OMRI-listed) | Yes (n = 5) | -0.29 (0.21) | 0.18 | 2.5 |
|  |  | No (n = 15) | Ref. | Ref. |  |
| Model 14 | Depth of bedding in stalls (cm)1 | Tiestalls and freestalls (n = 15) | -0.05 (0.03) | 0.10 | 2.6 |
| Model 15 | % udder hygiene scores ≥3 | Herds with available data (n = 20) | 0.75 (0.45) | 0.12 | 2.1 |
| Model 16 | Avg. udder hygiene score | Herds with available data (n = 20) | 0.39 (0.23) | 0.11 | 1.5 |
| Standardized 150-day milk (pounds)5 | |  |  |  |  |
| Model 17 | Parenteral supplementation vit. E and selenium | Regularly or occasionally (n = 7) | 9.0 (4.5) | 0.06 | 46.5 |
|  |  | No supplementation (n = 11) | Ref. | Ref. |  |
| Model 18 | Herd size | Herds with available data (n = 18) | 0.26 (0.14) | 0.07 | 33.1 |
| % udder hygiene scores ≥3 | |  |  |  |  |
| Model 19 | Depth of bedded pack (m) | Bedded pack herds (n = 5) | -0.5 (0.06) | 0.004 | 0.97 |
| Model 20 | Lying surface | Mattress or concrete (n = 13) | 0.17 (0.08) | 0.06 | 0.30 |
|  |  | Deep bedding (n = 8) | Ref. | Ref. |  |
| Model 21 | Depth of bedding in stalls (cm)1 | Tiestalls and freestalls (n = 15) | -0.02 (0.02) | 0.13 | 0.54 |
| Avg. udder hygiene score | |  |  |  |  |
| Model 22 | Depth of bedded pack (m) | Bedded pack herds (n = 5) | -0.96 (0.15) | 0.008 | 3.4 |
| Model 23 | Lying surface | Mattress or concrete (n = 13) | 0.33 (0.16) | 0.06 | 2.1 |
|  |  | Deep bedding (n = 8) | Ref. | Ref. |  |
| Model 24 | Depth of bedding in stalls (cm)1 | Tiestalls and freestalls (n = 15) | -0.06 (0.03) | 0.07 | 2.6 |
| 1 Stall bedding depth for freestalls and tiestalls bedded with wood shavings or sawdust | | | | | |
| 2 One farm used automatic milking system | | | | | |
| 3 DHIA data available for n = 19 herds. | | | | | |
| 4 DHIA data available for n = 20 herds. | | | | | |
| 5 DHIA data available for n = 18 herds. | | | | | |
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