

Table 11. Subset of NESARE forage and feed quality analyses for the GRAIN rotation in A) 2010 and B) 2012. The main management comparison in this rotation is reducing herbicide (RH) use via a variety of weed management tactics compared to a more "standard" herbicide program. In the RH rotation, forage is composed of alfalfa, orchard grass, pea, triticale, with pea and triticale permanently removed in the first cutting (year 1). In the SH rotation, forage is pure alfalfa for all three years. Standard errors (SE) are presented. See 2011 Annual Report for that year's data.

A) 2010		% Crude Protein			% Neutral Detergent Fiber			Net Energy of Lactation (Mcal/lb)		
Crop Entry	Harvest Date	RH	SH	(SE)	RH	SH	(SE)	RH	SH	(SE)
Canola <sup>^</sup>		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Corn Grain		<b>8.73</b>	<b>8.80</b>	0.16	<b>9.00</b>	<b>9.80</b>	0.554	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.95</b>	0.003
Soybean		<b>30.43</b>	<b>30.03</b>	0.31	<b>31.87</b>	<b>33.20</b>	0.14	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.01</b>	0.016
Forage Yr. 1 (cut #1)/silage ~	6/29/2010	<b>16.63</b>	<b>20.93</b>	1.26	<b>51.40</b>	<b>35.37</b>	1.058	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.68</b>	0.012
Forage Yr. 1 (cut #2)/hay	RH: 8/26/2010 SH: 8/3/2010	<b>18.87</b>	<b>25.00</b>	1.26	<b>43.53</b>	<b>44.07</b>	1.058	<b>0.57</b>	<b>0.52</b>	0.012
Forage Yr. 1 (cut #3)/hay #	9/14/2010	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
a,b: Different lowercase letters between RH and SH for a particular variable indicate a statistical difference between main management treatments at the 0.05 level.										
<sup>^</sup> For canola, one composite sample of meal was taken for all treatments in the first year.										
~ For alfalfa + grass, subsamples were taken for one crop entry because all crop entry points were new seedings.										
# For the 3rd cutting, only one treatment (SH) was cut.										

  

B) 2012		% Crude Protein			% Neutral Detergent Fiber			Net Energy of Lactation (Mcal/lb)		
Crop Entry	Harvest Date	RH	SH	(SE)	RH	SH	(SE)	RH	SH	(SE)
Canola <sup>^</sup>	7/3/2012	<b>37.40</b>	<b>40.75</b>	-	<b>30.30</b>	<b>30.35</b>	-	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.87</b>	-
Corn Grain	11/13/2012	<b>9.27</b>	<b>9.33</b>	0.11	<b>9.57</b>	<b>9.50</b>	0.41	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.94</b>	0.00
Soybean	10/25/2012	<b>39.80</b>	<b>40.20</b>	0.38	<b>22.67</b>	<b>21.03</b>	1.56	<b>1.17</b>	<b>1.18</b>	0.01
Forage Yr. 1 (cut #1)/silage	6/20/2012	<b>18.97 b</b>	<b>31.07 a</b>	0.97	<b>54.33 a</b>	<b>30.67 b</b>	1.57	<b>0.57 b</b>	<b>0.68 a</b>	0.01
Forage Yr. 1 (cut #2)/hay	7/30/2012	<b>21.63</b>	<b>25.00</b>	0.97	<b>43.93</b>	<b>37.07</b>	1.57	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.63</b>	0.01
Forage Yr. 1 (cut #3)/hay	9/6/2012	<b>20.77</b>	<b>22.33</b>	0.97	<b>45.20</b>	<b>40.30</b>	1.57	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.59</b>	0.01
Forage Yr. 2 (cut #1)/silage	RH: 5/11/12 SH: 5/25/12	<b>22.00</b>	<b>24.47</b>	0.87	<b>42.43</b>	<b>45.50</b>	1.33	<b>0.67 a</b>	<b>0.58 b</b>	0.01
Forage Yr. 2 (cut #2)/silage	RH: 6/8/12 SH: 6/26/12	<b>18.10 b</b>	<b>25.27 a</b>	0.87	<b>49.53</b>	<b>43.37</b>	1.33	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.60</b>	0.01
Forage Yr. 2 (cut #3)/hay	RH: 7/9/12 SH: 7/24/12	<b>17.70 b</b>	<b>23.50 a</b>	0.87	<b>52.47 a</b>	<b>41.23 b</b>	1.33	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.60</b>	0.01
Forage Yr. 2 (cut #4)/silage	RH: 8/3/12 SH: 8/22/12	<b>25.33</b>	<b>25.10</b>	0.87	<b>44.43</b>	<b>50.37</b>	1.33	<b>0.64 a</b>	<b>0.51 b</b>	0.01
Forage Yr. 2 (cut #5)/silage	9/6/2012	<b>30.90</b>	-	0.50	<b>32.55</b>	-	2.91	<b>0.87</b>	-	0.02
Forage Yr. 3 (cut #1)/silage	RH: 5/11/12 SH: 5/25/12	<b>19.73 b</b>	<b>26.03 a</b>	0.78	<b>47.20</b>	<b>43.03</b>	1.45	<b>0.650</b>	<b>0.597</b>	0.01
Forage Yr. 3 (cut #2)/hay	RH: 6/8/12 SH: 6/26/12	<b>19.20 b</b>	<b>25.47 a</b>	0.78	<b>49.83 b</b>	<b>41.13 a</b>	1.45	<b>0.627</b>	<b>0.610</b>	0.01
Forage Yr. 3 (cut #3)/silage	RH: 7/9/12 SH: 7/24/12	<b>17.73 b</b>	<b>23.50 a</b>	0.78	<b>50.53 a</b>	<b>41.23 b</b>	1.45	<b>0.603</b>	<b>0.600</b>	0.01
a,b: Different lowercase letters between RH and SH for a particular variable indicate a statistical difference between main management treatments at the 0.05 level.										