2008 Southeast Hay Contest Results

A Cooperative Extension Effort of Auburn University, Clemson University, The University of Florida, and The University of Georgia

Final results for the 2008 Southeastern Hay Contest are listed in Table 1. The results are broken down into the six categories of the contest: warm season perennial grass hay (bermudagrass, bahiagrass), perennial peanut and alfalfa hay, perennial cool season grass (tall fescue, orchardgrass, etc.), mixed and annual grass hay, grass baleage, and legume baleage categories. This contest is held in conjunction with the Sunbelt Agricultural Expo in Moultrie, GA.

Despite another drought-stressed growing season across the entire Southeast, 195 entries were received in 2008. Samples came from in from all across the Southeast and the overall average Relative Forage Quality (RFQ) was just over 118.

What is Relative Forage Quality? Past hay quality prediction equations were based on the fiber *concentration* of the hay crop. However, forage crops can have similar fiber content yet have very different digestibility. For instance, Tifton 85 bermudagrass often has a higher fiber concentration than other bermudagrass varieties, yet is more digestible. This improved digestibility results in enhanced animal performance, but is not reflected using traditional hay testing methods. The Relative Forage Quality index was developed by the University of Wisconsin to predict the fiber *digestibility* and animal intake of harvested crops. Unfortunately, these equations were not applicable to warm season forages like bermudagrass, bahiagrass or perennial peanut. Since 2003, hundreds of warm season samples have been used to develop an RFQ equation for bermudagrass and other warm season forages. Currently, all forage sample results from the UGA Feed and Forage Testing Lab in Athens contain an estimate of Relative Forage Quality. This value is a single, easy to interpret number that improves producer understanding of a forage's quality and helps in establishing a fair market value for the product.

How can Relative Forage Quality help me? Relative Forage Quality allows hay producers to easily categorize and price hay lots based on relative quality. Cattle producers can purchase hay lots depending on its end use. For example, there is little need to feed high-end quality hay to livestock that could easily utilize poorer quality forage. Hay with a RFQ of 115-130 can be fed to maintain beef cow-calf pairs, hay with an RFQ of 125-150 is adequate for stocker cattle or young growing replacement heifers, and hay with an RFQ of 140-160 is suitable for dairy cattle in the first three months of lactation. It is also easy to see that Relative Forage Quality could provide the framework for a quality hay marketing system. For example, hay with a RFQ of 155 could conceptually be labeled "premium" hay, while hay with an RFQ of 105 could be labeled "fair". This simple system could allow producers to price hay consistently and fairly across harvest maturity, fertilization regimes, or plant species (i.e. bermudagrass, bahiagrass, perennial peanut, or tall fescue).

Category winners from the 2008 Southeastern Hay Contest. (195 Total Samples Entered)					
Category	Farm	Crude Protein, %	TDN, %	RFQ	
Warm Season Perennial					
Grass Hay	<u>Overall Range:</u>	(6.2 - 20.6)	(40.9 - 66.3)	(70 – 144)	
	Yance Farms Inc.	16.3	64.6	` 144 ´	
	Houston Co., AL				
	Gill-Starr Farm	13.2	59.0	138	
	Anderson Co., SC				
	Lightning's Hay Farms	15.5	62.6	131	

Grady Co., GA

	, ,	, ,	(103 – 228)
	26.0	73.3	225
	00.0	74.0	045
	23.2	/1.6	215
·	22.0	60 5	191
	22.9	09.5	191
Collee Co., GA			
Overall Range:	(9.1 - 16.6)	(46.6 - 68.1)	(90 – 163)
Mitch Whitfield	16.6	68.1	່ 163 ໌
Banks Co., GA			
James Burton	15.6	55.5	122
Walker Co., GA			
John Watson	12.4	55.4	115
Walker Co., GA			
Overall Pango:	(56 10 1)	(12 5 66 0)	(78 – 178)
	,	, ,	(70 – 770) 178
	10.0	00.0	170
	11 3	60 5	162
	11.5	00.5	102
-	10 1	50.2	157
	10.1	55.Z	107
Overall Range:	(7.7 - 17.4)	(40.5 - 61.0)	(70 – 164)
	, ,	, ,	164
-			
-	17.4	60.0	155
-	8.5	57.3	153
Tuscaloosa Co., AL			
Ovorall Pango:	(11.8, 12.0)	(55 6 58 2)	(122 – 144)
			(122 – 144) 144
	12.5	JU.Z	144
	12 0	57 7	132
	16.3	51.1	IJZ
	11 8	55 G	122
	11.0	55.0	144
	Banks Co., GA James Burton Walker Co., GA John Watson Walker Co., GA <u>Overall Range:</u> Little Joe Reams Madison Co., FL Trice Farm Upson Co., GA Lightning's Hay Farms Grady Co., GA <u>Overall Range:</u> Hidden Valley Farms Oconee Co., SC Troy Platt Madison Co., FL Leavelle Farms	David Harden26.0Walker Co., GA $McCollum Farms$ 23.2Coffee Co., GA 23.2 Vickers Still Farm 22.9 Coffee Co., GA 22.9 Coffee Co., GA 16.6 Banks Co., GA 16.6 James Burton 15.6 Walker Co., GA 12.4 Walker Co., GA 12.4 Walker Co., GA 16.0 John Watson 12.4 Walker Co., GA 16.0 Madison Co., FL 11.3 Trice Farm 11.3 Upson Co., GA 10.1 Lightning's Hay Farms 10.1 Grady Co., GA 10.4 Ocoreall Range: $(7.7 - 17.4)$ Hidden Valley Farms 10.4 Oconee Co., SC 17.4 Madison Co., FL 17.4 Leavelle Farms 8.5 Tuscaloosa Co., AL $11.8 - 12.9$ Troy Platt 12.5 Madison Co., FL 12.5 Madison Co., FL 12.9 Madison Co., FL 12.9 Madison Co., FL 12.9 Madison Co., FL 12.9	David Harden 26.0 73.3 Walker Co., GA McCollum Farms 23.2 71.6 Coffee Co., GA Vickers Still Farm 22.9 69.5 Coffee Co., GA 16.6 68.1 Wickers Still Farm 22.9 69.5 Coffee Co., GA 16.6 68.1 Banks Co., GA 16.6 68.1 James Burton 15.6 55.5 Walker Co., GA 12.4 55.4 John Watson 12.4 55.4 Walker Co., GA 16.0 66.0 Madison Co., FL 11.3 60.5 Trice Farm 11.3 60.5 Upson Co., GA 10.1 59.2 Grady Co., GA 10.4 61.0 Ocerall Range: (7.7 - 17.4) (40.5 - 61.0) Hidden Valley Farms 10.4 61.0 Oconee Co., SC 77.3 10.4 61.0 Oconee Co., SC 77.3 10.4 60.0 Madison Co., FL 12.5 58.2 <