

**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

INTEGRATED SHRUB CONTROL STRATEGIES USING DILUTE CHEMICAL DEFOLIANTS

J.C.Noble¹, A.C.Grice² & W.J.Müller³

¹CSIRO Division of Wildlife & Ecology, P.O. Box 84, Lyneham, A.C.T. 2602.

²N.S.W. Agriculture, P.O. Box 286, Cobar, N.S.W. 2835.

³CSIRO Biometrics Unit, INRE, G.P.O. Box 1666, Canberra, A.C.T. 2601.

INTRODUCTION

Several management options are currently available for controlling shrubs in semi-arid woodlands although their use over extensive paddock areas is heavily constrained by cost factors (MacLeod and Johnston 1990). Research over the past decade has clearly shown that single treatment options for shrub management are generally unsuccessful in providing long-term solutions. While prescribed fire has shown considerable promise for treating large areas of shrub-infested range (Hodgkinson and Harrington 1985), several shrub species such as budda (*Eremophila mitchellii*), turpentine (*E. sturtii*) and some punty bush (*Cassia nemophila*), regenerate rapidly after fire by coppicing at ground level. Trials using artificial fuel have shown however that such species are vulnerable if a second defoliation can be applied one year later but only in the autumn (Noble *et al.* 1986, Hodgkinson 1989). The only way secondary treatment can be imposed so soon after prescribed fire is by using chemical defoliants. If these could be used at dilute concentrations to mimic fire defoliation, then chemical defoliation may prove to be a cost-effective option for broadscale use. This paper briefly summarises results obtained from preliminary screening studies of several chemical defoliants applied over a range of dosage rates to coppicing *Eremophila* shrubs.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Eleven chemicals (seven arboricides and four dessicants) were applied at six concentrations of active ingredient in November, 1990 to coppicing budda (*Eremophila mitchellii*) and turpentine (*E. sturtii*) on "Bundoon Belah", 40 km west of Cobar, N.S.W, where large blocks had been chained, windrowed and burnt in 1986. Treatments were randomised in six blocks (c. 200 x 50 m) with application rates (0, 12%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 100% of active ingredient concentration for root kill by the arboricides and 0, 50%, 100%, 135%, 170% and 200% for the dessicants) arranged as main plots split for shrub species. The arboricides used in this study were CT Roundup (450 g/L Glyphosate), Arsenal (250 g/L Imazapur + 60 g/L Isopropylamine), Garlon (600 g/L Triclopyr), Grazon (300 g/L Triclopyr + 100 g/L Picloram), Brushoff (600 g/L Metasulfuron Methyl), Velpar (250 g/L Hexazinone), Starane (300 g/L Fluroxpyr) while the dessicants were Gramoxone (200 g/L Paraquat), Ethrel (480 g/L Ethephon), Pix (38 g/L Mepiquat) and Harvade (600 g/L Dimethipin). None of these materials are currently registered for the purposes described in this paper. Duplicate plants were sprayed in each plot at low volume (2 sweeps of 30 ml each per coppice) using an Ag-murf Gas Gun(R) powered by propane gas. Treated plants were regularly monitored and rated for both effect (i.e. change in leaf colour) and defoliation (0=no effect and 10=100% effect).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

While it is too early to make definite statements on particular chemicals and rates of application, early results from this initial screening are extremely promising. Although half the chemicals tested in this experiment can probably be eliminated from further trials, some induced rapid defoliation, especially at higher rates (e.g. CT-Roundup), whereas others produced progressively greater defoliation over time (e.g. Arsenal), even at lower rates. Further studies are required to refine dosages, especially on young coppice regrowth (i.e. one season's growth). Such treatment is seen, *a priori*, to be more efficient because there is less canopy surface to be treated and chemicals may be more physiologically active when applied to young leaves. Recent observations on one-year-old *Eremophila* coppice sprayed in April 1992 have shown that some chemicals are active at the lowest concentration (12%). If such dilute concentrations are indeed effective, then large-scale testing of such treatments would logically follow. Large paddock size (up to 8,000 ha)

may dictate the need for appropriate operational procedures involving both aerial ignition for primary fire treatment (Noble 1986) and aerial spraying for secondary treatment (Mathews 1979).

With the advent of ultra low volume spraying (1-5 L/ha) using spinning cage atomisers and specific ULV formulations, small droplet size can result in significant spray dispersal during broad swathe spraying. Such treatment, even if only at low volumes (5-15 L/ha), is likely to be the most efficient technology, with more country being sprayed per load in regions where adequate supplies of good quality water may be limiting.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is currently being funded by the Australian Wool Research and Development Corporation (Project No. CLL 12). Ms Karen Hudson was responsible for data collection and processing and her assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- Hodgkinson, K.C. 1989. Prescribed fire for shrub control in sheep rangelands. In Proc. Conf. *Weeds, Invertebrate Pests and Diseases of Australian Sheep Pastures*, Ballarat, Vic., (in press).
- Hodgkinson, K.C. and Harrington, G.N. 1985. The case for prescribed burning to control shrubs in eastern semi-arid woodlands. *Australian Rangeland Journal* 7:64-74.
- MacLeod, N.D. and Johnston, B.J. 1990. An economic framework for the evaluation of rangeland restoration projects. *Australian Rangeland Journal* 12:40-53.
- Mathews, G.A. 1979. 'Pesticide Application Methods'. Longman, London.
- Noble, J.C. 1986. Prescribed fire in mallee rangelands and the potential role of aerial ignition. *Australian Rangeland Journal* 8:118-130.
- Noble, J.C., Harrington, G.N. and Hodgkinson, K.C. 1986. The ecological significance of irregular fire in Australian rangelands. In 'Rangelands: A Resource Under Siege', eds P.J. Joss, P.W. Lynch and O.B. Williams, pp. 577-580. Australian Academy of Science, Canberra.