



University of Kentucky
UKnowledge

International Grassland Congress Proceedings

21st International Grassland Congress / 8th
International Rangeland Congress

Evaluation of the Productivity and Grazing Capacity of Cool Season Grasses

H. A. Lardner

Western Beef Development Centre, Canada

C. Ward

University of Saskatchewan, Canada

L. Froehlich

Western Beef Development Centre, Canada

L. Zemplak

Western Beef Development Centre, Canada

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/21/9-1/39>

The 21st International Grassland Congress / 8th International Rangeland Congress took place in Hohhot, China from June 29 through July 5, 2008.

Proceedings edited by Organizing Committee of 2008 IGC/IRC Conference

Published by Guangdong People's Publishing House

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.

Evaluation of the productivity and grazing capacity of cool season grasses

H A Lardner¹, C Ward², L Froehlich¹ and L Zemplak¹

¹Western Beef Development Centre, Humboldt, Saskatchewan, S0K 2A0, Canada; ²Department of Animal and Poultry Science, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5A8, Canada. E-mail: blardner.wbdc@pami.ca

Key words : cumulative yield, steers, grazing, Bromus, Festuca

Introduction Pasture forage is an important part of beef production systems in western Canada and producers require adapted species that are high yielding and provide good nutritional quality. Small plot evaluation of forages uses mowing or clipping to simulate grazing events; however, these treatments lack animal effects such as pulling, treading, manure and urine deposition and short stubble heights (Thompson *et al.* 2003). Thus, forage varieties need to be evaluated for livestock performance and stand persistence under grazed conditions before they are recommended for use in grazing operations. This study compared hybrid bromegrass, crested wheatgrass and tall fescue for yield and animal grazing days (AGD) over 3 seasons (2005-2007).

Materials and methods The study was conducted at the Termuende Research Ranch, Lanigan, Saskatchewan, Canada. The study site was a 64 ha pasture situated on a mixed Orthic Black soil. In 2003, crested wheatgrass (CWG) (*Agroropyron cristatum* (L.) Gaertn.) cv. Goliath, hybrid bromegrass (HBG) (*B. riparius* Rehm X *B. inermis* Leyss) cv. AC Knowles and tall fescue (TF) (*Festuca arundinacea* Schreb.) cv. Courtney were established in 2.08 ha replicate paddocks and compared to a long established stand of CWG (control pasture) over 3 years. Each year steers were randomly allocated to pastures when growth was approximately 20 cm high. Quadrats (0.25 m²) were taken to determine cumulative dry matter yield (CDMY). Statistics were completed using SAS Mixed Model and means were separated using the least significant difference multiple range test when P < 0.05.

Results In 2005 all pastures were grazed only once, however in 2006 and 2007 sufficient re-growth allowed for two grazing periods for most species (Table 1). In 2005 Goliath CWG yielded 3X greater (P < 0.05) than control. However in 2006 and 2007, HBG and TF yielded 83 and 30% greater than control, respectively. In P1 each year, AGD were greater than in P2 which may be due to lower forage quantity in P2. CWG, HBG and TF had greater AGD (P < 0.05) each year compared to control pastures, indicating the potential of these grasses as pasture species for beef producers.

Table 1 Yield and grazing days of forage species.

| | Control | CWG | HBG | TF | SEM ^z | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----|
| <i>Cumulative dry matter yield (kg ha⁻¹)</i> | | | | | | |
| 2005 | 2485 ^b | 7515 ^a | 3136 ^b | 3932 ^{ab} | 727 | 4 |
| 2006(P1) ^y | | 3744 | 3293 | 4381 | 4887 | 884 |
| (P2) | | 0 ^b | 2504 ^a | 2484 ^a | 0 ^b | 187 |
| Total | 3744 | 5798 | 6863 | 4887 | 798 | 8 |
| 2007(P1) | | 4281 | 5985 | 6878 | 5931 | 545 |
| (P2) | | 3172 | 3234 | 2660 | 3745 | 300 |
| Total | 7453 | 9219 | 9538 | 9676 | 812 | 3 |
| <i>Animal grazing days (d ha⁻¹)</i> | | | | | | |
| 2005 | 78 ^b | 215 ^a | 252 ^a | 232 ^a | 14 | 3 |
| 2006(P1) | | 148 ^d | 215 ^{bc} | 254 ^{bc} | 235 ^{bc} | 19 |
| (P2) | | 0 ^c | 84 ^a | 49 ^{ab} | 78 ^a | 10 |
| Total | 148 ^c | 299 ^{ab} | 303 ^{ab} | 313 ^{ab} | 24 | 8 |
| 2007(P1) | | 84 ^c | 140 ^b | 240 ^a | 280 ^a | 15 |
| (P2) | | 64 ^b | 112 ^a | 104 ^a | 64 ^b | 10 |
| Total | 148 ^b | 252 ^a | 344 ^a | 344 ^a | 17 | 6 |

^z SEM = standard error of the mean. ^y P1 = grazing period 1; P2 = grazing period 2. ^{a-d} Least square means in the same row with different letters differ at P < 0.05.

Conclusions Results indicate these varieties under grazed conditions had superior CDMY and AGD compared to control and may be well suited to season-long grazing. Similar yields but greater grazing days for HBG and TF suggests these varieties will perform better than CWG over several years.