



University of Kentucky
UKnowledge

International Grassland Congress Proceedings

23rd International Grassland Congress

On-Offer and Residual Forage in a Massai-*Leucaena* Pasture at Different *Leucaena* Density

Enrique Cortés-Díaz

Universidad Autónoma Chapingo, Mexico

Juan Peñate Arcos

Universidad Autónoma Chapingo, Mexico

José L. Zaragoza Ramírez

Universidad Autónoma Chapingo, Mexico

Pedro A. Martínez-Hernández

Universidad Autónoma Chapingo, Mexico

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/igc>



Part of the [Plant Sciences Commons](#), and the [Soil Science Commons](#)

This document is available at <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/igc/23/2-6-2/3>

The 23rd International Grassland Congress (Sustainable use of Grassland Resources for Forage Production, Biodiversity and Environmental Protection) took place in New Delhi, India from November 20 through November 24, 2015.

Proceedings Editors: M. M. Roy, D. R. Malaviya, V. K. Yadav, Tejveer Singh, R. P. Sah, D. Vijay, and A. Radhakrishna

Published by Range Management Society of India

This Event is brought to you for free and open access by the Plant and Soil Sciences at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Grassland Congress Proceedings by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

On-offer and residual forage in a Massai-*Leucaena* pasture at different *Leucaena* density**Enrique Cortés-Díaz, Juan Peñate Arcos, José L. Zaragoza Ramírez, Pedro A. Martínez-Hernández**

Universidad Autónoma Chapingo, Texcoco, Mexico

*Corresponding author e-mail: ecodia@yahoo.com.mx**Keywords:** Grazing, Tree legume, Tropical grass, Silvopastoral**Introduction**

Mexican livestock producers in tropical areas are increasingly interested on the establishment of silvopastoral systems based on *Leucaena* (*Leucaena leucocephala* (Lam.) de Wit) and different tropical grasses as the Massai grass (*Panicum maximum* cv Massai); among questions raised on this is the importance of *Leucaena* density in relation to forage available. Then the objective of the study was to determine total and by species on-offer and residual forage in a grazed Massai-*Leucaena* pasture with different *Leucaena* density.

Materials and Methods

Three *Leucaena* densities: 1363, 2232 and 4916 plants/ha during three grazing cycles were evaluated under a split-plot design (Steel and Torrie, 1988) main plots were *Leucaena* densities and sub-plot the grazing cycles; there were three replications, the experimental unit was a plot with 13 *Leucaena* plants, each plot was of 26.4, 58.3 and 95.3 m² for the highest to the lowest *Leucaena* density, respectively. For all plant densities *Leucaena* rows were 2 m apart, target plant densities were reached by changing plant distance within the row. Massai grass was sown between *Leucaena* rows. Experiment lasted from late June to early September, when grass growth rate is the highest. Grazing was done by replications, within each grazing cycle only three replications were grazed at the time. Grazing and resting periods were five and 37 days respectively, grazers were ewes at a stocking density of 264 ewes/ha, ewes grazed on grass pasture while not in the experimental plots. On-offer and residual Massai grass were measured by clipping to ground level three 0.25 m² per plot, for *Leucaena* one plant was selected and all leaves removed, in each sampling a different plant was selected, no estimation of residual *Leucaena* forage was done as there was no leave left at the end of the each grazing period.

Results and Discussion

Massai forage on-offer was not influenced ($P>0.05$) by *Leucaena* density, grazing cycle and the interaction between factors (Table 1). The different *Leucaena* densities left a constant surface free from tree cover to the Massai grass, the 2 m aisle that could explain this pattern of response.

Table 1: Massai forage on-offer (t DM/ha) at three grazing cycles and three *Leucaena* plant densities.

Grazing cycle	Leucaena density (plants/ha)			Grazing cycle mean
	4916	2232	1363	
First	2.98 ±0.38	3.40 ±0.92	2.38 ±0.45	2.9 ±0.45
Second	2.23 ±0.36	3.06 ±0.94	3.21 ±0.61	2.83 ±0.61
Third	2.56 ±0.15	2.48 ±0.28	2.85 ±0.45	2.63 ±0.48
Season mean	2.57 ±0.18	2.98 ±0.41	2.81 ±0.28	
No effect ($P>0.05$) of <i>Leucaena</i> density, grazing cycle and interaction of these factors.				

Leucaena forage on-offer was determined ($P<0.05$) by density, grazing cycle and the interaction of these two factors. The trend was to a lower forage on-offer with the lowest density and in the last grazing cycle (Table 2). Lower *Leucaena* density might determine regrowth potential towards the end of the active growing season.

Table 2: Leucaena forage on-offer (t DM/ha) at three grazing cycles and three Leucaena plant densities.

Grazing cycle	Leucaena density (plants/ha)			Grazing cycle mean
	4916	2232	1363	
First	0.30 ±0.07 ab	0.41 ±0.05 a	0.19 ±0.04 ab	0.301 ±0.04A
Second	0.19 ±0.07 ab	0.13 ±0.02 b	0.08 ±0.01 b	0.132 ±0.02B
Third	0.17 ± 0.07 ab	0.18 ±0.06 ab	0.09 ±0.04 b	0.147 ±0.03B
Season mean	0.218 ±0.04AB	0.243 ±0.05A	0.118 ±0.02B	

a, b means with at least one letter in common are not different; A,B means within columns or rows with at least one letter in common are not different.

Residual Massai forage showed same response pattern than forage on-offer of not being influenced ($P>0.05$) by any of the two factors and of the interaction of them (Table 3). The higher Leucaena density was not enough to promote a higher grass intake by ewes.

Table 3: Massai residual forage (t DM/ha) at three grazing cycles and three Leucaena plant densities.

Grazing cycle	Leucaena density (plants/ha)			Grazing cycle mean
	4916	2232	1363	
First	0.49 ±0.03	0.84 ±0.32	1.38 ±0.36	0.9 ±0.19
Second	0.86 ±0.16	1.25 ±0.37	1.54 ±0.19	1.22 ±0.16
Third	1.58 ±0.06	1.27 ±0.26	1.50 ±0.42	1.45 ±0.15
Season mean	0.98 ±0.16	1.12 ±0.17	1.47 ±0.17	

No effect ($P>0.05$) of Leucaena density, grazing cycle and interaction of these factors

Conclusion

Massai grass is not influenced by Leucaena density on the amounts of forage on-offer and residual; while, Leucaena forage on-offer tends to be influenced by density at the end of the grazing season.

References

Steel R. G. D. and Torrie J. H. 1988. *Bioestadística: Principios y Procedimientos*. Edit. McGraw-Hill. México, D. F.