

2011

Texas Cool-Season Annual Forage and Grain Results

varietytesting.tamu.edu/wheat



2011

Texas Cool-Season Annual Forage and Grain Results

varietytesting.tamu.edu/wheat

Texas AgriLife Extension Service

Robert Duncan, Daniel Hathcoat, Brent Bean, Todd
Baughman, David Drake, Larry Redmon, and Travis Miller

Texas AgriLife Research

Amir Ibrahim, Jim Muir, Lloyd Nelson, Jackie Rudd, Russell
Sutton, Jason Baker, Bryan Simoneaux, and Rex Herrington

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Texas Regions Map.....	3
2011 Texas Region Overview.....	4
Forage Trial Agronomic Data.....	5
Dual-Purpose Forage and Grain Trials:	
College Station Agronomy Farm.....	6
College Station Beef Center.....	7
McGregor.....	8
Forage Trials:	
Bushland.....	9
Clifton.....	10
College Station Agronomy Farm.....	11
College Station Beef Center.....	12
Delta County.....	13
McGregor.....	14
Overton Oats.....	15
Overton Small Grains.....	16
Vernon.....	17
Acknowledgements.....	18

Introduction

The Cool-Season Annual Forage Variety Trial data presented in the following pages is coordinated and implemented by numerous Texas AgriLife Extension and Research faculty and staff. We also appreciate the cooperation from numerous Texas County Extension Agents, producers, and private industry partners that contributed locations, property, and seed to conduct these field trials. The purpose of this publication is to provide unbiased yield data for forage producers across the state. With this information, Texas forage producers can make an educated decision regarding the most appropriate varieties for their geographic region. This is the second annual publication for the state-wide variety trial.

Variety Selection:

Selection of an appropriate small grain variety is one of the most important decisions a producer will make. This decision can impact the potential yield (forage and/or grain), forage nutritive value, disease and insect management, and maturity of the crop. It is important producers have diversity in the varieties planted on their farms and this depends on the intended use of the crop (grain, forage, or dual-purpose). Variety diversification spreads the risk associated with potentially devastating pests (rusts, Hessian fly, wheat curl mite, greenbugs, etc.) and yield loss from adverse environmental factors (freeze, drought, hail, etc.).

Producers should select no fewer than two varieties to plant on their farms and preferably more, depending upon size, location, and purpose of fields. Variety selection should be based upon sound data produced from university trials and other reliable sources. Varieties should be chosen based on multiple years of data (yield, pest resistance, grain and forage nutritive value and maturity). High yields over multiple years and multiple locations demonstrate a variety's ability to perform well over diverse environmental factors. Stable yield performance of quality grain or forage is the best variety selection tool. It is important to consider decreasing yield over a two or three year time frame, which may reflect a change in disease and/or insect resistance.


When selecting a variety for the 2011-12 season, producers need to consider the results from the 2010-11 season, recognizing the unusually dry, hot conditions that impacted yield and quality. We strongly encourage producers to look at multiple year averages, where available, and to look at numerous relevant variety trial locations.

Interpreting the Data:

Forage yield, grain yield and test weight, at each location have been statistically analyzed using recommended procedures. The statistical analysis provides the mean, coefficient of variation (CV), and LSD values. It is important to note these statistical values to prevent misinterpretation of the data.

The mean is another term for the average. Therefore, a mean yield is the average of all plots for each variety within a trial. The CV value, expressed as a percentage, indicates the level of unexplained variability present within the trial. A high CV value indicates a lot of variability existed within the trial not related to normal variations that might be expected between the varieties in the test. This variability may be the result from non-uniform stands, non-uniform insect or disease pressure, variability in harvesting, or other issues. High CV values indicate a great deal of variation due to factors other than the genetic variation between varieties. Readers should be aware when CV values are above 25% (for forage yields). These high CV values should cause concerns regarding the validity of the data as a true representation of varietal performance. The CV values for forage trials are much higher than those of grain trials due to the added variation of harvesting plants multiple times throughout the growing season and the different growth habits between varieties. The LSD value is a numeric range to help the reader determine if the varieties performed differently from each other within the trial. If the LSD value is 300 lb/ac in a trial in which Variety A yielded 1500 lb/ac and Variety B yielded 1150 lb/ac, then Variety A is said to be significantly better. In a trial with an LSD value of 300 lb/ac at a 0.05 (or 5%) level, the statistical inference is that Variety A would yield better than Variety B in 19 out of 20 trials conducted in which there was a 300 lb difference in yield. In this hypothetical comparison, you might have a 20th trial with a 300 lb/ac difference where there is not truly a difference between Variety A and B, but random chance caused the 300 lb difference.

Texas Regional Map



Legend:

Texas High Plains



Texas Rolling Plains



Texas Blacklands and East Texas



South Texas



2011 Texas Region Overview

Texas Blacklands:

The Texas Blacklands this past growing season gave many challenges to forage producers. Inconsistent rainfall from September to May was one of the biggest challenges. Yield was lower than expected for all varieties tested within this region. In addition to the drought, freezing temperatures on February 3-4 had a significant impact on forage yield.

Texas High Plains:

Unfortunately, 2011 will go down as one of the driest years on record for the region. Much of the dryland wheat acreage throughout the area was not harvested for grain due to the drought. Dryland grazing yield was limited based on poor stands early in the growing season. Irrigated forage yield was also reduced. Many producers quit watering wheat early in order to concentrate their irrigation water on establishing corn or cotton. Insect infestation and disease infection were low throughout most of the region, although wheat streak mosaic and barley yellow dwarf disease could be found in some fields. A few low lying fields in the southwest panhandle was damaged by freezing temperatures.

Texas Rolling Plains:

A severe drought was observed in the Texas Rolling Plains this year. Isolated rains allowed for some early planting and grazing but much of the area was planted dry with the anticipation of rain. Limited winter precipitation allowed for some emergence, but heat and drought resulted in limited fields being harvested for grain with poor yield. Irrigated yield was also reduced by heat and drought.

South Texas:

Forage producers in South Texas, like the rest of the state, had extremely dry conditions. Below normal rainfall was persistent throughout the entire growing season. Poor stands in dryland fields lead to poor grazing potential. Fields planted in September for fall forage performed respectively due to early rainfalls and subsequent crop establishment. Later emerging fields were severely damaged by the freeze in February.

Forage Trial Agronomic Data

Location ¹	Yield Limiting Issues	Planting Date	Fertilizer (Total)	Pesticide Applied	Pesticide Application Date
			(lb N/a)		
Bushland	Above Average Temperatures	9/15/2010	none	none	-
Clifton	Drought and Heat Stressed	9/30/2010	70	Huskie	2/15/2011
College Station – Agronomy²	Above Average Temperatures	9/21/2010	140	Huskie	2/16/2011
College Station – Beef Center	Severe Drought Stressed	9/21/2010	100	Huskie	2/16/2011
Delta County	Uneven Stands	9/30/2010	100	Amber	9/30/2010
McGregor	Drought and Heat Stressed	9/30/2010	110	Huskie	2/15/2011
Millersview	Severe Drought Stressed; Data Not Shown	9/28/2010	90	none	-
Overton	Above Average Temperatures	9/22/2010	225	Glean	11/4/2010
Vernon²	Severe Drought	9/21/2010	80	none	-

¹These locations were planted with a seeding rate of 90 lb/a, under conventionally tilled field conditions. Bushland was the only location planted with a seeding rate of 60 lb/a. All seed was treated with Gaucho XT at a rate of 3.4 oz/cwt.

²College Station-Agronomy and Vernon were the only locations that were irrigated. College Station required an additional 1.5 inches of supplemental irrigation, while Vernon only applied 0.5” for stand establishment.

Irrigated Dual-Purpose Small Grains, College Station Agronomy Farm, 2011

2011 Rank ^a	Variety	Classification ¹	Source	Total Forage Yield lb/a	12/8/10 Clipping Yield lb/a	Grain Yield bu/a	Grain Test Weight lb/bu	Grain Protein %
1	Doans	HRWW	Syngenta	4,569	2,627	37.3	63	12.9
2	HG 76-30	Oat	East Texas Seed	4,039	2,443	49.2	31	2.5
3	Fannin	HRWW	Syngenta	3,932	2,396	20.5	62	13.0
4	Terral LA 841	SRWW	Terral	3,868	2,111	25.0	61	12.7
5	Coronado	HRWW	Syngenta	3,847	1,826	31.0	62	13.2
6	TAM 304	HRWW	TAMU	3,768	2,091	27.2	61	12.6
7	TAM 112	HRWW	TAMU	3,667	2,244	30.2	62	12.1
8	RAM 99016	Oat	LSU	3,619	1,734	55.8	32	1.7
9	USG 3555	SRWW	UniSouth Genetics	3,595	1,855	22.6	58	13.9
10	Big Mac	Oat	McGregor Mill and Grain	3,577	2,033	41.2	30	2.8
11	Billings	HRWW	OSU	3,558	2,077	19.3	63	12.9
12	Duster	HRWW	OSU	3,334	2,026	36.1	62	11.7
13	Shocker	HRWW	WestBred	3,318	1,438	27.6	60	13.1
14	Weathermaster 135**	HRWW	Unknown	3,302	1,491	24.3	56	14.1
15	Magnolia	SRWW	Syngenta	3,244	1,313	29.8	59	12.1
16	TAMsoft 700	SRWW	TAMU	3,221	1,912	31.8	60	12.3
17	TAM 111	HRWW	TAMU	3,152	1,720	26.6	61	12.9
18	Coker 9553**	SRWW	Syngenta	3,149	1,762	35.4	61	12.8
19	TAM 401**	HRWW	TAMU	3,145	1,329	23.4	59	13.5
20	Endurance	HRWW	OSU	3,104	1,642	22.6	59	13.0
21	Horizon 201	Oat	Horizon	3,060	1,446	61.4	29	-
22	Pete	HRWW	OSU	3,054	1,659	30.8	61	12.7
23	SantaFe	HRWW	WestBred	3,041	1,061	25.3	61	13.4
24	Bob	Oat	UA	2,979	1,725	51.3	31	2.7
25	Fuller	HRWW	KSU	2,927	1,321	31.9	61	12.9
26	Heavy Grazer	SRWW	East Texas Seed	2,926	1,585	15.7	59	13.7
27	Armour	HRWW	WestBred	2,897	1,536	28.3	59	12.6
28	Sturdy 2K	HRWW	TAMU	2,818	663	36.7	60	12.6
29	Deliver	HRWW	OSU	2,760	1,652	23.5	61	13.0
30	Jagger	HRWW	KSU	2,738	1,128	23.1	60	14.3
31	Greer	HRWW	Syngenta	2,732	1,200	31.0	60	12.4
32	TAM 203	HRWW	TAMU	2,727	897	30.5	60	13.2
33	TAMO 606	Oat	TAMU	2,688	975	69.3	29	2.0
34	Bullet	HRWW	OSU	2,607	1,404	23.8	60	14.5
35	Jagalene	HRWW	Syngenta	2,526	1,186	29.6	62	12.5
36	TAMO 406	Oat	TAMU	2,518	1,168	71.5	31	1.7
37	Jackpot	HRWW	Syngenta	2,454	1,217	28.3	60	13.3
38	Harrison	Oat	LSU	2,285	724	67.0	31	3.1
39	Horizon 270	Oat	Horizon	2,219	777	62.3	29	-

Mean 3,153 1,574 34.8 54 11

^aRanking is based on total forage production
(the sum of all forage clippings)

CV (%) 20.5 30.6^b 11.6 1.5 6.9
LSD (5%) 895 667 5.7 1.1 1.2

**Awnless/Beardless

¹Hard Red Winter Wheat (HRWW)
Soft Red Winter Wheat (SRWW)

^bTrials with a coefficient of variation (CV) $\geq$ 25% contain excessive experimental error.
Readers should consider trials in a similar environment to confirm varietal yield.

Dryland Dual-Purpose Small Grains, College Station Beef Center, 2011

2011				Total Forage Yield	Grain Yield	Grain Test Weight	Grain Protein
Rank ^a	Variety	Classification ¹	Source	lb/a	bu/a	lb/bu	%
1	Shocker	HRWW	WestBred	2,989	16.8	56	14.5
2	TAMO 606	Oat	TAMU	2,979	3.4	-	2.8
3	Jagalene	HRWW	Syngenta	2,897	14.8	60	12.5
4	Horizon 270	Oat	Horizon	2,871	7.0	-	-
5	Pete	HRWW	OSU	2,497	10.4	58	14.0
6	TAM 401**	HRWW	TAMU	2,446	16.3	56	14.7
7	SantaFe	HRWW	WestBred	2,442	17.5	58	14.8
8	Duster	HRWW	OSU	2,402	17.9	58	14.5
9	Horizon 201	Oat	Horizon	2,341	7.1	-	-
10	Terral LA 841	SRWW	Terral	2,240	18.7	56	14.9
11	Big Mac	Oat	McGregor Mill and Grain	2,238	5.5	-	4.1
12	Fannin	HRWW	Syngenta	2,096	16.6	59	14.1
13	TAMsoft 700	SRWW	TAMU	2,092	14.6	56	13.5
14	Heavy Grazer	SRWW	East Texas Seed	2,061	16.5	55	13.3
15	USG 3555	SRWW	UniSouth Genetics	2,025	15.9	56	13.6
16	HG 76-30	Oat	East Texas Seed	2,014	7.3	20	2.8
17	Coronado	HRWW	Syngenta	1,980	19.4	58	13.1
18	Harrison	Oat	LSU	1,973	16.1	-	2.8
19	TAM 112	HRWW	TAMU	1,931	18.7	59	12.8
20	Magnolia	SRWW	Syngenta	1,892	19.0	57	13.5
21	Bullet	HRWW	OSU	1,877	16.1	57	15.8
22	Greer	HRWW	Syngenta	1,810	9.7	56	14.3
23	Jackpot	HRWW	Syngenta	1,791	19.3	58	14.7
24	RAM 99016	Oat	LSU	1,758	15.1	30	2.2
25	TAM 111	HRWW	TAMU	1,703	13.3	58	15.2
26	Billings	HRWW	OSU	1,686	17.6	58	14.3
27	Endurance	HRWW	OSU	1,661	15.5	55	14.5
28	TAM 304	HRWW	TAMU	1,616	23.9	57	14.0
29	Sturdy 2K	HRWW	TAMU	1,575	22.2	57	14.0
30	Deliver	HRWW	OSU	1,558	12.5	59	13.9
31	Fuller	HRWW	KSU	1,552	18.6	58	14.6
32	Coker 9553**	SRWW	Syngenta	1,392	18.1	58	12.9
33	TAM 203	HRWW	TAMU	1,392	15.9	57	14.7
34	Bob	Oat	UA	1,376	1.9	-	1.5
35	Armour	HRWW	WestBred	1,286	22.2	57	13.0
36	Doans	HRWW	Syngenta	1,283	21.1	60	14.4
37	TAMO 406	Oat	TAMU	1,281	19.2	-	1.5
38	Weathermaster 135**	HRWW	Unknown	1,220	12.3	56	14.2
39	Jagger	HRWW	KSU	1,136	15.8	58	15.2
Mean				1,932	15.1	55	12
CV (%)				45.2 ^b	30.8 ^b	7.4	9.7
LSD (5%)				1,249	6.5	5.5	1.9

^aRanking is based on total forage production
(the sum of all forage clippings)

**Awnless/Beardless

¹Hard Red Winter Wheat (HRWW)

^bTrials with a coefficient of variation (CV) $\geq$ 25% contain excessive experimental error.
Readers should consider trials in a similar environment to confirm varietal yield.

Dryland Dual-Purpose Small Grains, McGregor, 2011

2011 Rank ^a	Variety	Classification ¹	Source	Total Forage Yield	Grain Yield	Grain Test Weight	Grain Protein
				lb/a	bu/a	lb/bu	%
1	Heavy Grazer	SRWW	East Texas Seed	1,311	15.2	55	12.3
2	Billings	HRWW	OSU	1,242	15.4	57	11.8
3	HG 76-30	Oat	East Texas Seed	1,205	25.4	32	2.5
4	TAM 112	HRWW	TAMU	1,173	12.3	57	12.2
5	Big Mac	Oat	McGregor Mill and Grain	1,024	23.7	25	-
6	TAM 401**	HRWW	TAMU	988	17.5	54	12.6
7	TAM 304	HRWW	TAMU	977	25.9	55	11.8
8	RAM 99016	Oat	LSU	952	33.8	31	2.7
9	Coker 9553**	SRWW	Syngenta	947	27.5	57	11.9
10	Fuller	HRWW	KSU	944	21.5	57	12.6
11	Terral LA 841	SRWW	Terral	940	19.7	55	11.5
12	Doans	HRWW	Syngenta	936	24.2	58	12.4
13	Fannin	HRWW	Syngenta	924	16.8	57	13.0
14	Coronado	HRWW	Syngenta	879	18.5	57	12.2
15	USG 3555	SRWW	UniSouth Genetics	879	19.6	57	13.6
16	TAMO 606	Oat	TAMU	854	37.2	31	2.4
17	Magnolia	SRWW	Syngenta	851	20.5	54	11.9
18	Duster	HRWW	OSU	847	24.4	58	12.1
19	TAM 203	HRWW	TAMU	845	21.6	55	11.1
20	Jagger	HRWW	KSU	811	15.5	55	12.1
21	Bob	Oat	UA	810	27.6	31	2.3
22	Jackpot	HRWW	Syngenta	799	24.9	56	12.2
23	Greer	HRWW	Syngenta	779	21.2	54	11.8
24	Horizon 201	Oat	Horizon	765	35.6	31	-
25	Shocker	HRWW	WestBred	761	23.0	57	12.2
26	Jagalene	HRWW	Syngenta	681	16.0	57	10.9
27	SantaFe	HRWW	WestBred	666	20.5	56	12.3
28	Harrison	Oat	LSU	621	28.9	32	2.0
29	Weathermaster 135**	HRWW	Unknown	619	23.4	55	11.7
30	Pete	HRWW	OSU	610	27.8	60	10.9
31	TAM 111	HRWW	TAMU	603	20.8	58	12.4
32	Armour	HRWW	WestBred	599	21.3	56	10.9
33	Deliver	HRWW	OSU	595	21.9	59	12.8
34	TAMO 406	Oat	TAMU	594	34.5	33	2.5
35	Endurance	HRWW	OSU	587	30.4	57	12.2
36	TAMsoft 700	SRWW	TAMU	581	27.9	56	11.7
37	Sturdy 2K	HRWW	TAMU	543	31.2	56	10.9
38	Bullet	HRWW	OSU	482	18.7	58	13.0
39	Horizon 270	Oat	Horizon	462	28.5	31	-
Mean				812	23.6	50	10.4
CV (%)				38.0 ^b	14.3	5.1	7.9
LSD (5%)				431	4.7	3.6	1.3

^aRanking is based on total forage production
(the sum of all forage clippings)

**Awnless/Beardless

¹Hard Red Winter Wheat (HRWW)
Soft Red Winter Wheat (SRWW)

Triticale (TRIT)

Winter Barley (WB)

Triticale (TRIT)

[†] yield average for 2010 and 2008

[‡] yield average for 2010, 2008, and 2007

²Paramount Seeds (PS)

^bTrials with a coefficient of variation (CV) $\geq$ 25% contain excessive experimental error.
Readers should consider trials in a similar environment to confirm varietal yield.

Forage Trial; Bushland, Dryland, 2011

2011 Rank	Variety	Classification ¹	Source	Dry Matter Yield (lb/a)	
				2011 Total ^a	2011 First Clip 12/2/10
1	Greer	HRWW	Syngenta	4,228	1,471
2	Endurance	HRWW	OSU	3,910	1,503
3	Hatcher	HRWW	CSU	3,699	1,359
4	TAM 111	HRWW	TAMU	3,644	1,455
5	TAM 203	HRWW	Syngenta	3,621	1,231
6	Jackpot	HRWW	Syngenta	3,472	1,199
7	Duster	HRWW	OSU	3,248	1,343
8	TAM 304	HRWW	TAMU	3,151	544
9	TAM 112	HRWW	TAMU	3,150	927
10	TAM 111 (2x seeding rate*)	HRWW	TAMU	3,123	1,151
11	Trical 348	TRIT	Syngenta	2,903	1,231
12	TAM 401**	HRWW	Syngenta	2,883	544
13	Walken	Oat	UK ²	2,740	384
14	Weathermaster 135**	HRWW	Unknown	2,498	560
Mean				3,305	1,065
CV (%)				28.6 ^b	21.9
LSD (5%)				1,467	391

^aTotal forage is the sum of all forage clippings

*120 lbs/a

**Awnless/Beardless

¹Hard Red Winter Wheat (HRWW)
Triticale (TRIT)

²University of Kentucky

^bTrials with a coefficient of variation (CV) $\geq 25\%$ contain excessive experimental error.
Readers should consider trials in a similar environment to confirm varietal yield.

Forage Trial; Clifton, Dryland, 2011

2011 Rank	Variety	Classification ¹	Source	Dry Matter Yield (lb/a)	
				2011 Total ^a	2011 First Clip
					3/3/11
1	TAM 401**	HRWW	Syngenta	5,373	1,910
2	Fannin	HRWW	Syngenta	5,124	1,661
3	Weathermaster 135**	HRWW	Unknown	4,966	1,333
4	Greer	HRWW	Syngenta	4,875	1,807
5	Heavy Grazer	SRWW	East Texas Seed	4,862	1,564
6	Bullet	HRWW	OSU	4,777	925
7	TAMO 606	Oat	TAMU	4,693	1,916
8	Sturdy 2K	HRWW	TAMU	4,646	1,067
9	TAM 203	HRWW	Syngenta	4,508	1,224
10	TAMcale 6331	TRIT	Syngenta	4,181	1,240
11	TAMcale 5019	TRIT	Syngenta	4,046	1,479
12	RAM 99016	Oat	LSU	3,931	1,522
13	TAMO 406	Oat	TAMU	3,785	1,325
14	Harrison	Oat	LSU	3,733	1,286
15	Bob	Oat	UA	3,697	1,308
16	Wintergrazer	HRWW	Pennington Seed	3,663	755
17	TX07CS3701*	Oat	TAMU	3,624	1,412

	Mean	4,429	1,395
^a Total forage is the sum of all forage clippings	CV (%)	17.4	25.8^b
*Experimental Lines	LSD (5%)	1,081	511

**Awnless/Beardless

¹Hard Red Winter Wheat (HRWW)

Soft Red Winter Wheat (SRWW)

Triticale (TRIT)

^bTrials with a coefficient of variation (CV) $\geq$ 25% contain excessive experimental error.
Readers should consider trials in a similar environment to confirm varietal yield.

Forage Trial; College Station Agronomy Research Farm, Irrigated, 2011

2011	Rank	Variety	Classification ¹	Source	Dry Matter Yield (lb/a)			
					2011 Total ^a	2011 First Clip 12/8/10	2 Year [†] Mean	2 Year [†] First Clip
	1	TAMbar 501	WB	TAMU	7,129	1,295	-	-
	2	Pennbar 66	WB	Penn State	6,652	1,829	9,495	1,536
	3	P-919**	WB	Paramount Seeds	6,459	2,444	10,403	2,283
	4	TAMO 606	Oat	TAMU	6,411	1,602	7,110	1,238
	5	Sturdy 2K	HRWW	TAMU	6,281	2,089	6,677	1,395
	6	TX06V7266*	HRWW	TAMU	6,103	2,164	-	-
	7	TX05A001188*	HRWW	TAMU	5,988	2,024	-	-
	8	TX05CS347-1*	Oat	TAMU	5,708	1,572	8,322	1,320
	9	TX07CS3697*	Oat	TAMU	5,596	2,051	6,820	1,523
	10	TX06A001263*	HRWW	TAMU	5,494	1,682	6,852	1,138
	11	TAMcale 6331	TRIT	Syngenta	5,249	2,087	7,952	1,743
	12	Fannin	HRWW	Syngenta	5,127	2,232	6,444	1,512
	13	Heavy Grazer	SRWW	East Texas Seed	5,085	1,553	-	-
	14	TAM 401	HRWW	Syngenta	5,042	2,040	5,934	1,607
	15	RAM 99016	Oat	LSU	5,022	2,167	-	-
	16	TAMO 406	Oat	TAMU	5,002	1,301	7,701	1,181
	17	TX05CS542*	Oat	TAMU	4,996	2,062	8,369	2,007
	18	Weathermaster 135**	HRWW	Unknown	4,942	1,648	6,825	1,371
	19	TX06A001281*	HRWW	TAMU	4,919	1,725	-	-
	20	TAMcale 5019	TRIT	Syngenta	4,851	1,434	7,790	1,409
	21	TAM 203	HRWW	Syngenta	4,841	1,459	6,634	1,190
	22	TAMsoft 700	SRWW	TAMU	4,708	2,105	-	-
	23	Harrison	Oat	LSU	4,700	1,300	-	-
	24	Maton II	Rye	Noble Foundation	4,452	1,243	-	-
	25	TX07CS2783*	Oat	TAMU	4,425	1,190	-	-
	26	Bob	Oat	UA	4,395	1,583	-	-

	Mean	5,368	1,765	7,555	1,497
^a Total forage is the sum of all forage clippings	CV (%)	17.9	39.1^b	24.4	41.7^b
*Experimental Lines	LSD (5%)	1,353	972	2,096	776

**Awnless/Beardless

¹Hard Red Winter Wheat (HRWW)

Soft Red Winter Wheat (SRWW)

Triticale (TRIT)

Winter Barley (WB)

Triticale (TRIT)

[†]Forage average for 2011 and 2010

^bTrials with a coefficient of variation (CV) ? 25% contain excessive experimental error.

Readers should consider trials in a similar environment to confirm varietal yield.

Forage Trial; College Station Beef Center, Dryland, 2011

2011 Rank	Variety	Classification ¹	Source	Dry Matter Yield (lb/a)	
				2011	2011
				Total ^a	First Clip 12/8/10
1	Fannin	HRWW	Syngenta	6,043	1,790
2	TX05CS556*	Oat	TAMU	5,614	2,675
3	TX05CS542*	Oat	TAMU	5,600	2,815
4	TX07CS1066*	Oat	TAMU	5,592	2,745
5	TX07CS3697*	Oat	TAMU	5,264	2,709
6	TAMsoft 700	SRWW	TAMU	5,205	1,906
7	Bob	Oat	UA	5,080	2,324
8	Sturdy 2K	HRWW	TAMU	5,073	1,991
9	TAMO 406	Oat	TAMU	4,841	1,884
10	Heavy Grazer	SRWW	East Texas Seed	4,828	1,547
11	Terral LA 841	SRWW	Terral Seed	4,799	1,690
12	TAM 203	HRWW	Syngenta	4,527	1,350
13	TAMcale 6331	TRIT	Syngenta	4,519	1,740
14	RAM 99016	Oat	LSU	4,505	1,717
15	TAM 401	HRWW	Syngenta	4,244	1,381
16	Harrison	Oat	LSU	4,139	1,479
17	TAMO 606	Oat	TAMU	4,095	1,584
18	TX09CS1112*	Oat	TAMU	4,046	1,815
19	Elbon	Rye	Noble Foundation	3,998	1,192
20	Weathermaster 135**	HRWW	Unknown	3,812	1,251
21	USG 3555	SRWW	UniSouth Genetics	3,778	1,265
22	TAMcale 5019	TRIT	Syngenta	3,731	1,727
23	TX05CS347-1*	Oat	TAMU	3,409	1,501
24	Coker 9700	SRWW	Syngenta	3,357	1,299
25	TX07CS1056*	Oat	TAMU	3,291	1,487

Mean 4,535 1,795

^aTotal forage is the sum of all forage clippings

CV (%) 20.9 37.8^b

*Experimental Lines

LSD (5%) 1,336 963

**Awnless/Beardless

¹Hard Red Winter Wheat (HRWW)

Soft Red Winter Wheat (SRWW)

Triticale (TRIT)

Winter Barley (WB)

^bTrials with a coefficient of variation (CV) ? 25% contain excessive experimental error.

Readers should consider trials in a similar environment to confirm varietal yield.

Forage Trial; Delta County, Dryland, 2011

				Dry Matter Yield (lb/a)
2011				2011 Total ^a
Rank	Variety	Classification ¹	Source	12/8/10
1	TX05CS347-1*	Oat	TAMU	8109
2	Magnolia	SRWW	Syngenta	7703
3	Heavy Grazer	SRWW	East Texas Seed	7262
4	TAMcale 6331	TRIT	Syngenta	7161
5	Coker 9553 @ 121 lb/a	SRWW	Seeding Rate	7026
6	Sturdy 2K	HRWW	TAMU	7021
7	TAM 401**	HRWW	Syngenta	6971
8	Fannin	HRWW	Syngenta	6943
9	TAMcale 5019	TRIT	Syngenta	6854
10	Coker 9553 @ 81 lb/a	SRWW	Seeding Rate	6849
11	TX07CS2783*	Oat	TAMU	6703
12	TAM 203	HRWW	Syngenta	6641
13	USG 3555	SRWW	UniSouth Genetics	6571
14	Weathermaster 135**	HRWW	Unknown	6565
15	TAMsoft 700	SRWW	TAMU	6561
16	Coker 9553 @ 162 lb/a	SRWW	Seeding Rate	6424
17	TX05A001188*	HRWW	TAMU	6217
18	P-919	WB	Paramount Seeds	6008
19	TAMO 606	Oat	TAMU	5966
20	Harrison	Oat	LSU	5953
21	TAMbar 501	WB	TAMU	5945
22	TX05CS542*	Oat	TAMU	5937
23	TX07CS3697*	Oat	TAMU	5922
24	AGS 2035	SRWW	AgSouth Genetics	5893
25	TX06V7266*	HRWW	TAMU	5854
26	TX06A001281*	HRWW	TAMU	5707
27	TAMO 406	Oat	TAMU	5327
28	Nora	Oat	UA	5064
29	Maton II	Rye	Noble Foundation	4955
30	Walken	Oat	UK	4784
31	TX06A001263*	HRWW	TAMU	4670
32	RAM 99016	Oat	LSU	4448
33	Penbar 66	WB	Penn State	4286
34	Ozark	Oat	UA	4203
35	Bob	Oat	UA	4174
Mean				6,076
CV (%)				24.1
LSD (5%)				2,054

^aTotal forage is the sum of all forage clippings

*Experimental Lines

**Awnless/Beardless

¹Hard Red Winter Wheat (HRWW)

Soft Red Winter Wheat (SRWW)

Triticale (TRIT)

Winter Barley (WB)

Triticale (TRIT)

Forage Trial; McGregor, Dryland, 2011

2011	Rank	Variety	Classification ¹	Source	Dry Matter Yield (lb/a)	
					2011 Total ^a	2011 First Clip 3/3/11
	1	Fannin	HRWW	Syngenta	5,841	3,059
	2	P-919**	WB	Paramount Seeds	5,705	2,823
	3	TAMbar 501	WB	TAMU	5,705	1,300
	4	TX05A001188*	HRWW	TAMU	5,528	2,128
	5	Sturdy 2K	HRWW	TAMU	5,463	1,626
	6	Heavy Grazer	SRWW	East Texas Seed	5,257	2,686
	7	Maton II	Rye	Noble Foundation	4,977	2,721
	8	TAM 203	HRWW	Syngenta	4,920	2,006
	9	Penbar 66	WB	Penn State	4,868	1,771
	10	TX06V7266*	Wheat	TAMU	4,864	1,753
	11	TX06A001281*	HRWW	TAMU	4,806	1,537
	12	TX06A001263*	HRWW	TAMU	4,734	1,771
	13	Weathermaster 135**	HRWW	Unknown	4,666	1,807
	14	TAMsoft 700	SRWW	TAMU	4,625	1,980
	15	TAMcale 6331	TRIT	Syngenta	4,550	1,962
	16	TAMcale 5019	TRIT	Syngenta	4,508	2,293
	17	TAM 401**	HRWW	Syngenta	4,391	2,077
	18	Harrison	Oat	LSU	3,943	1,962
	19	TX05CS347-1*	Oat	TAMU	3,694	1,627
	20	Bob	Oat	UA	3,530	1,258
	21	RAM 99016	Oat	LSU	3,378	1,351
	22	TAMO 406	Oat	TAMU	3,179	947
	23	TAMO 606	Oat	TAMU	3,164	1,149
	24	TX07CS3697*	Oat	TAMU	3,149	1,451
	25	TX05CS542*	Oat	TAMU	2,529	1,087
	26	TX07CS2783*	Oat	TAMU	2,120	505
					Mean	4,388
					CV (%)	19.6
					LSD (5%)	1,209
						1,794
						42.2^b
						1,066

^aTotal forage is the sum of all forage clippings

*Experimental Lines

**Awnless/Beardless

¹Hard Red Winter Wheat (HRWW)

Soft Red Winter Wheat (SRWW)

Triticale (TRIT)

Winter Barley (WB)

^bTrials with a coefficient of variation (CV) ? 25% contain excessive experimental error.

Readers should consider trials in a similar environment to confirm varietal yield.

Oat Forage Trial; Overton, Dryland, 2011

			Dry Matter Yield (lb/a)				
			2011 Total ^a	2011 First Clip 12/6/10	2 Year Mean [†]	2 Year First Clip [†]	
2011 Rank	Variety	Source					
1	TAMO 606	TAMU	5,893	1,440	5,429	898	
2	TX05CS3347-1*	TAMU	5,662	1,357	6,024	1,088	
3	Ozark	UA	5,527	1,442	5,370	916	
4	Heavy Grazer 76-30	East Texas Seed	5,433	1,615	5,225	830	
5	TX07CS3701*	TAMU	5,410	1,271	-	-	
6	Harrison	LSU	5,367	1,311	5,836	1,542	
7	Nora	UA	5,356	1,237	4,905	1,336	
8	RAM 99016	LSU	5,343	1,390	5,444	994	
9	TX05CS542*	TAMU	5,331	1,485	5,359	1,314	
10	LA03063-S4*	LSU	5,231	1,767	-	-	
11	TX07CS2783*	TAMU	5,200	1,176	5,460	1,191	
12	TX07CS3697*	TAMU	5,129	1,848	5,237	1,137	
13	LA05006-65S1*	LSU	4,978	1,436	5,678	1,415	
14	TAMO 406	TAMU	4,830	1,273	5,183	996	
15	Bob	UA	4,830	1,375	4457	1,201	
16	Walken	Justin Seed Company	4,690	1,194	4,785	780	
17	07-LFWH*	-	4,675	1,905	-	-	
18	F10522-92-S1*	UF	4,446	1,362	4,664	950	
			Mean	5,185	1,438	5,270	1,106
			CV (%)	13.0	18.0		
			LSD (5%)	821	309		
Total forage is the sum of all forage clippings							
*Experimental Lines							

^aTotal forage is the sum of all forage clippings

*Experimental Lines

[†] Forage average for 2011 and 2010

Forage Trial; Overton, Dryland, 2011

				Dry Matter Yield (lb/a)			
				2011	2011	2 Year	2 Year
				Total ^a	First Clip	Mean [†]	First Clip [†]
2011							
Rank	Variety	Classification ¹	Source		12/6/10		
1	NF 95319B*	RYE	Noble Foundation	6,207	3,070	-	-
2	Elbon	RYE	Noble Foundation	6,141	2,330	-	-
3	NF 95307A*	RYE	Noble Foundation	5,724	2,479	6,475	1,758
4	Bates RS4	RYE	Noble Foundation	5,721	2,605	5,765	1,509
5	Maton II	RYE	Noble Foundation	5,440	1,888	6,100	1,508
6	TAMbar 501	WB	TAMU	5,430	2,067	-	-
7	Fannin	HRWW	Syngneta	5,241	1,641	5,090	1,197
8	TX06A001281*	HRWW	TAMU	5,188	1,277	-	-
9	TAMsoft 700	SRWW	TAMU	5,144	1,440	5,257	1,153
10	Pennbar 66	WB	Penn State	5,016	1,664	5,824	1,014
11	P-919**	WB	Paramount Seed	5,006	1,983	4,976	1,222
12	TAMcale 5019	TRIT	TAMU	4,667	1,346	5,234	760
13	Coker 9553	SRWW	Syngneta	4,526	717	4,873	511
14	USG 3555	SRWW	UniSouth Genetics	4,509	1,382	4,636	1,098
15	Magnolia	SRWW	Syngneta	4,464	1,561	4,827	1,152
16	Sturdy 2K	HRWW	TAMU	4,413	1,223	4,884	781
17	TAM 113	HRWW	TAMU	4,325	1,692	4,564	988
18	TAM 401**	HRWW	TAMU	4,310	1,361	4,702	1,199
19	TX06V7266*	HRWW	TAMU	4,302	1,187	-	-
20	Ranger	SRWW	Noble Foundation	4,271	1,376	-	-
21	05TF 131d	TRIT	-	4,252	1,344	-	-
22	TAM 203	HRWW	TAMU	4,147	1,139	4,178	720
23	Weathermaster 135**	HRWW	Unknown	4,097	1,454	4,275	890
24	Heavy Grazer 73-06	SRWW	East Texas Seed	4,091	1,139	4,795	845
25	TX05A001188*	HRWW	TAMU	4,054	1,325	-	-
26	TX06A001263*	HRWW	TAMU	4,021	1,490	4,440	1,027
27	AGS 2035	SRWW	AgSouth Genetics	3,884	1,255	-	-
28	06TF 148e	TRIT	-	3,754	1,521	-	-
29	TAMcale 6331	TRIT	TAMU	3,746	521	4,536	487
30	MBS 327	SRWW	MBS Seeds	3,708	866	4,039	643

Mean 4,660 1,545 4,973 1,023

CV (%) 13.0 21.0

LSD (5%) 699 380

^aTotal forage is the sum of all forage clippings

*Experimental Lines

**Awnless/Beardless

¹Hard Red Winter Wheat (HRWW)

Soft Red Winter Wheat (SRWW)

Triticale (TRIT)

Winter Barley (WB)

[†]Forage average for 2011 and 2010

Forage Trial; Vernon, Irrigated, 2011

2011 Rank	Variety	Classification ¹	Source	Dry Matter Yield (lb/a)			
				2011 Total ^a	2011 First Clip 12/8/10	2 Year Mean [†]	2 Year First Clip [†]
1	Maton II	Rye	Noble Foundation	5,274	1,434	-	-
2	TX05V7259*	HRWW	TAMU	4,300	977	-	-
3	TAMcale 6331	TRIT	Syngenta	4,112	702	5,821	2,096
4	TAMcale 5019	TRIT	Syngenta	3,860	613	5,904	2,051
5	TX06V7266*	HRWW	TAMU	3,816	681	-	-
6	Weathermaster 135**	HRWW	Unknown	3,809	943	6,368	2,437
7	TAM 112	HRWW	TAMU	3,785	803	-	-
8	TX06A001281*	HRWW	TAMU	3,764	986	-	-
9	Lockett	HRWW	TAMU	3,690	694	-	-
10	Fannin	HRWW	Syngenta	3,690	789	6,224	2,320
11	TAM 113	HRWW	TAMU	3,679	1,100	6,346	2,507
12	P-919**	WB	Paramount Seeds	3,641	953	-	-
13	Harrison	Oat	LSU	3,576	726	-	-
14	Heavy Grazer	SRWW	East Texas Seed	3,523	625	-	-
15	Bob	Oat	UA	3,515	879	-	-
16	TX06A001263*	HRWW	TAMU	3,483	666	6,090	2,213
17	TAMO 406	Oat	TAMU	3,483	601	5,889	2,141
18	TX05A001188*	HRWW	TAMU	3,436	666	-	-
19	TX05CS542*	Oat	TAMU	3,405	746	5,624	2,262
20	TX07CS2783*	Oat	TAMU	3,399	849	-	-
21	TX07CS3697*	Oat	TAMU	3,397	948	5,923	2,372
22	TX07CS3701*	Oat	TAMU	3,392	783	-	-
23	TX05CS347-1*	Oat	TAMU	3,340	685	5,568	2,088
24	RAM 99016	Oat	LSU	3,279	640	6,925	2,121
25	Sturdy 2K	HRWW	TAMU	3,275	810	6,624	2,338
26	Pennbar 66	Barley	Penn State	3,269	882	-	-
27	TAM 203	HRWW	Syngenta	3,255	547	5,887	2,191
28	TAM 401	HRWW	Syngenta	3,036	769	6,142	2,447
29	TAMO 606	Oat	TAMU	2,737	649	5,529	2,014
30	TAMbar 501	WB	TAMU	2,718	548	5,737	2,018

Mean 3,565 790 6,037 2,226

^aTotal forage is the sum of all forage clippings

CV (%) 21.0 36.2^b

*Experimental Lines

LSD (5%) 1,050 402

**Awnless/Beardless

¹Hard Red Winter Wheat (HRWW)

Triticale (TRIT)

Winter Barley (WB)

[†]Forage average for 2011 and 2010

^bTrials with a coefficient of variation (CV) ? 25% contain excessive experimental error.

Readers should consider trials in a similar environment to confirm varietal yield.

Acknowledgements

The authors of this publication would like to express great appreciation to the generosity of the following companies who donated the seed for this research. Without partners such as these, research like this would not be possible.



DOUGLASS KING SEED CO.



The information given herein is for educational purposes only. Reference to commercial products or trade names is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by the Texas AgriLife Extension Service is implied.

Educational programs of the Texas AgriLife Extension Service are open to all people without regard to race, color, sex, disability, religion, age, or national origin. The Texas A&M University System, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and County Commissioners Courts of Texas Cooperating.

Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, Acts of Congress of May 8, 1914, as amended, and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture, Edward G. Smith, Director, Texas AgriLife Extension Service, Texas A&M System.