

TEXAS A&M AGRI LIFE EXTENSION

2016 Wildlife Food Plot Variety Trial

Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service

Dwight Sexton, CEA-Ag, Gonzales Co.; Michael Haynes and Julie Zimmerman, CEAs-Ag, Caldwell Co.; Rachel Bauer, CEA-Ag, Bastrop Co.; Travis Franke and Jeff Hanselka, CEAs-Ag, Guadalupe Co.

Cooperator: The Luling Foundation Farm

Location: Luling, Texas

Situation: Supplemental nutrition for deer and other wildlife provides an attraction for wildlife, as well as providing nutrition for increased growth and reproduction. With many companies providing wildlife food plot seed, little research has been done to show yields that can be expected relative to the investment provided.

Objectives:

- 1) Demonstrate proper management practices.
- 2) Compare establishment, yields, and other characteristics of several wildlife food plot blends.

Method: Tillage: The seed bed was disked twice, and a firm seed bed was established. The seed was drilled, and then a roller-packer followed to improve the seed-soil contact.

Planting Date: October 22, 2015

Plot size: Plot sizes were 12 feet wide, and had a length of 50 feet, with three replications randomly located in the field. The plots were

harvested on two occasions with a sub-sample size collected of 1 square foot. Following the harvest of each sub-sample, the plots were shredded in an effort to simulate grazing and reduce lodging.

Seeding Rate: 8-90 lbs./acre, as per supplier's request.

Fertilizer: 400 lbs. of 10-20-10 were applied on 11/16/2015.

Harvest: The plots were harvested on February 11 and April 12, 2016.
These results are listed in Table 1.

Multiple Year Averages: An average of previous year's harvest is compiled in Table 2.

Results

Table 1.

2016 Luling Foundation Winter Forage Variety Trial

Variety	Cutting	Cutting	Total	
	2/11/2016	4/12/2016		
Wildlife Food Plot				
Buck Buffet Cereal Blend	2468.4	6534.0	9002	<i>a</i>
Buck Buffet Triple Pea Blend	2032.8	2323.2	4356	<i>bc</i>
Buck Buffet Legume Blend	2178	871.2	3049	<i>c</i>

Means followed by same letter do not significantly differ (P=.05, Duncan's New MRT).

Mean comparisons performed only when AOV Treatment P(F) is significant at mean comparison OSL.

Missing data estimates are included in columns: Yates=2 .

Wildlife Food Plot Trials

Variety	2001	2002	2003	2005	2006	2007	2008	2010	2014	2015	2016
PastureMax Clover Ryegrass Blend						9293					
Rack Builder Fall Blend				6825							
Rack Builder Plus				4647							
Rackmaster						10164					
Rackmaster Deer Greens					5953						
Rackmaster Fall Deer Mix					6824						
Rack King Deer Plot 2019				5953							
Rack King Deer Plot RKF 2004				8422							
Rack King Plus						10164	5227				
Tecomate Fall Max Attract 'AL' Mixture		6045									
Typhon/Ryegrass Blend			7704								
Wildlife Nutrition Big Buck Xcellerator	7981	7360									
Wildlife Nutrition Fall Blend	8980	6074									

*Averaged yield includes only varieties trialed since 2008. All other varieties trialed are listed, but not averaged across years.

** Reported in pounds of dry matter per acre.

Conclusions:

The plot was planted into dry conditions in the Luling area. The following growing season included ample moisture, with average heat. Spring rains continued to allow for moist conditions for the plots.

Also of interest, and not evaluated in this study, is the price variance per pound of seed and the recommended planting rates, as well as palatability of these forages at various growth and maturity stages. Producers should decide if they are getting the best return for their investment, and weigh the different wildlife blend advantages and disadvantages accordingly.

Producers should note that the totals accumulated from this study represent results under the conditions that were present during this trial, and may not see the same results under their own growing conditions. Results over multiple years are needed to give producers a true indication of trends that can be expected with different varieties.

We wish to thank the following groups for assisting with this trial: The Luling Foundation, Mike Kuck, manager, and his staff, for assisting with this trial; W. James Grichar, TAES-Beeville for assistance with the statistical analysis; and the following company for donating seed for this trial: Pogue Agri-Partners Inc.

Disclaimer Clause:

Trade names of commercial products used in this report are included only for better understanding and clarity. Reference to commercial products or trade names is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by the Texas A&M System is implied. Readers should realize that results from one experiment do not represent conclusive evidence that the same response would occur where conditions vary.