

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 [^]		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Corn Grain		8.73	8.80	0.16	9.00	9.80	0.554	0.95	0.95	0.003
Soybean		30.43	30.03	0.31	31.87	33.20	0.14	1.02	1.01	0.016
Forage Yr. 1 (cut #1)/silage ~	6/29/2010	16.63	20.93	1.26	51.40	35.37	1.058	0.61	0.68	0.012
Forage Yr. 1 (cut #2)/hay	RH: 8/26/2010 SH: 8/3/2010	18.87	25.00	1.26	43.53	44.07	1.058	0.57	0.52	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.										
[^] 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 [^]	7/3/2012	37.40	40.75	-	30.30	30.35	-	0.90	0.87	-
Corn Grain	11/13/2012	9.27	9.33	0.11	9.57	9.50	0.41	0.94	0.94	0.00
Soybean	10/25/2012	39.80	40.20	0.38	22.67	21.03	1.56	1.17	1.18	0.01
Forage Yr. 1 (cut #1)/silage	6/20/2012	18.97 b	31.07 a	0.97	54.33 a	30.67 b	1.57	0.57 b	0.68 a	0.01
Forage Yr. 1 (cut #2)/hay	7/30/2012	21.63	25.00	0.97	43.93	37.07	1.57	0.59	0.63	0.01
Forage Yr. 1 (cut #3)/hay	9/6/2012	20.77	22.33	0.97	45.20	40.30	1.57	0.58	0.59	0.01
Forage Yr. 2 (cut #1)/silage	RH: 5/11/12 SH: 5/25/12	22.00	24.47	0.87	42.43	45.50	1.33	0.67 a	0.58 b	0.01
Forage Yr. 2 (cut #2)/silage	RH: 6/8/12 SH: 6/26/12	18.10 b	25.27 a	0.87	49.53	43.37	1.33	0.61	0.60	0.01
Forage Yr. 2 (cut #3)/hay	RH: 7/9/12 SH: 7/24/12	17.70 b	23.50 a	0.87	52.47 a	41.23 b	1.33	0.58	0.60	0.01
Forage Yr. 2 (cut #4)/silage	RH: 8/3/12 SH: 8/22/12	25.33	25.10	0.87	44.43	50.37	1.33	0.64 a	0.51 b	0.01
Forage Yr. 2 (cut #5)/silage	9/6/2012	30.90	-	0.50	32.55	-	2.91	0.87	-	0.02
Forage Yr. 3 (cut #1)/silage	RH: 5/11/12 SH: 5/25/12	19.73 b	26.03 a	0.78	47.20	43.03	1.45	0.650	0.597	0.01
Forage Yr. 3 (cut #2)/hay	RH: 6/8/12 SH: 6/26/12	19.20 b	25.47 a	0.78	49.83 b	41.13 a	1.45	0.627	0.610	0.01
Forage Yr. 3 (cut #3)/silage	RH: 7/9/12 SH: 7/24/12	17.73 b	23.50 a	0.78	50.53 a	41.23 b	1.45	0.603	0.600	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.										