PROCEEDINGS OF THE AUSTRALIAN RANGELAND SOCIETY BIENNIAL CONFERENCE

Official publication of The Australian Rangeland Society

Copyright and Photocopying

© The Australian Rangeland Society 2012. All rights reserved.

For non-personal use, no part of this item may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior permission of the Australian Rangeland Society and of the author (or the organisation they work or have worked for). Permission of the Australian Rangeland Society for photocopying of articles for non-personal use may be obtained from the Secretary who can be contacted at the email address, rangelands.exec@gmail.com

For personal use, temporary copies necessary to browse this site on screen may be made and a single copy of an article may be downloaded or printed for research or personal use, but no changes are to be made to any of the material. This copyright notice is not to be removed from the front of the article.

All efforts have been made by the Australian Rangeland Society to contact the authors. If you believe your copyright has been breached please notify us immediately and we will remove the offending material from our website.

Form of Reference

The reference for this article should be in this general form; Author family name, initials (year). Title. *In*: Proceedings of the nth Australian Rangeland Society Biennial Conference. Pages. (Australian Rangeland Society: Australia).

For example:

Anderson, L., van Klinken, R. D., and Shepherd, D. (2008). Aerially surveying Mesquite (*Prosopis* spp.) in the Pilbara. *In*: 'A Climate of Change in the Rangelands. Proceedings of the 15th Australian Rangeland Society Biennial Conference'. (Ed. D. Orr) 4 pages. (Australian Rangeland Society: Australia).

Disclaimer

The Australian Rangeland Society and Editors cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information obtained in this article or in the Proceedings of the Australian Rangeland Society Biennial Conferences. The views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Australian Rangeland Society and Editors, neither does the publication of advertisements constitute any endorsement by the Australian Rangeland Society and Editors of the products advertised.



The Australian Rangeland Society

ARISTIDA INFESTATIONS OF MITCHELL GRASSLANDS: SELECTING CONTROL OPTIONS

Piet Filet¹ and Nicki Elmes²

Pasture Management Branch, Queensland Department of Primary Industries, ¹ PO Box 81, Emerald Q 4702, ² PO Box 282, Charleville Q 4470.

THE PROBLEM

Increasing infestations of Aristida leptopoda (whitespear) and A. latifolia (feathertop) have decreased productivity from Mitchell grassland (Astrebla spp.) grazing enterprises. The seed of these perennial grasses causes significant contamination in fleeces, which costs in the order of \$4.7 to 5.5 million per annum (1989/90 prices) for the Mitchell grasslands of Queensland (1). Aristida spp. are relatively unpalatable, particularly to sheep, and as a result the more palatable grasses are preferentially grazed. Increased grazing pressure on the desirable and palatable grasses reduces their growth and further enhances the opportunity for increases in the Aristida populations.

THE NEED

Maintaining a dominance of Mitchell grass can minimise an Aristida invasion. But to reduce established Aristida infestations, the best chance of success are control options that reduce the mature Aristida population and/or reduces the seed load. The desirable perennial grasses must be retained otherwise any advantage of Aristida control will be lost.

Control options need to exploit vulnerable features in the growth of whitespear and feathertop. These features include:

- susceptibility to defoliation, whereby tiller mortality is increased and seed production is reduced (2);
- 2. viability of soil seed reserves is low after two years (1);
- during wet summer conditions (30-35°C), the growth of Aristida spp. is less than that of Mitchell grass (3).

CONTROL OPTIONS

Grazing with cattle

Cattle are less selective than sheep in their grazing of Mitchell grass pastures and cattle include whitespear and feathertop in their diet (1). As long as moderate grazing pressures are applied, the presence of cattle either alone or in conjunction with sheep can contain whitespear and feathertop to a small proportion of the pasture.

Sheep alone will not control infestations of whitespear or feathertop. Grazing by cattle at high grazing pressures (1 to 3 beasts/ha) for two to three months results in defoliation with a reduction in plant height and seedhead numbers. If repeated over two to three years, a reduction in whitespear and feathertop density may occur. Cattle need to be introduced at the start of the whitespear and feathertop growing season, as at this stage available green leaf and nutritional quality of these plants are at a maximum.

<u>Baling</u>

Following the accumulation of surplus pasture, some graziers bale the pasture. Consequently whitespear or feathertop is included in the hay and as a result of this defoliation their proportions in the pasture have declined following a number of balings. The greater resilience of Mitchell grass to defoliation has ensured that it persists following baling.

Herbicide application

Whitespear and feathertop are suitable targets for a wick-wiper herbicide application. As these plants are generally avoided by stock, they are taller than the remaining desirable species. Wick-wiper applications of glyphosate (30% concentration) can kill half the whitespear population and reduce the growth of the remaining whitespear plants. Mitchell grass plants, untouched by this type of herbicide application, have a competitive advantage during subsequent summer growing periods and have an opportunity to become dominant in the previously whitespear infested pasture.

<u>Fire</u>

Prior to European settlement, fires in the Mitchell grasslands were more frequent than in recent times. Fire stimulates Mitchell grass (4), whilst the recovery of whitespear and feathertop is considered to be less vigorous and depends on rainfall and grazing conditions. Fire reduced Aristida spp. numbers in sub-coastal Queensland (5), but in western Queensland management with fire is commonly viewed as risky.

Forage and grain cropping

Cultivation kills mature whitespear and feathertop tussocks. If a cropping phase is greater than two years, regeneration of *Aristida* spp. will be minimised as little viable seed remains. However, the recovery to a desirable perennial grassland following cropping can only occur if the soil seed reserves of the desirable species remains and is not unduly affected by cultivation.

Resowing with desirable grasses

Increasing the size of the soil seed reserve, by resowing with Mitchell grass and blue grass (*Dichanthium serecium*) can aid in increasing the recruitment of desirable grasses in whitespear and feathertop dominant pastures. Mitchell grass seed is now readily available, small scale collections of blue grass have been made and there is also interest in harvesting other useful native grasses.

REFERENCES

1. Filet, P.G. (1990). The ecology and control of whitespear grass (Aristida leptopoda) and feathertop (A. latifolia) in Mitchell grass in south west Queensland. Final Report, AWC.

2. Brandon, N.J. (1987). Effects of repeated defoliation on the growth and inflorescence production of Aristida latifolia, A. leptopoda and Aristida squarrosa. 4th Year Project, Ag. Dept., U. of Qld.

3. Christie, E.K. (1979). Eco-physiological studies of the semiarid grasses Aristida leptopoda and Astrebla lappacea. Aust. Ecol. 4: 223-228.

4. Scanlan, J.C. (1983). Changes in tiller and tussock characteristics of Astrebla lappacea after burning. Aust. Rangl. J. 5: 13-19.

5. Paton, C.J. and Rickett, K.G. (1989). Burning then spelling reduces wiregrass (Aristida spp.) in black spear grass pastures. Trop. Grassl. 23: 211-218.