

**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](mailto: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 15<sup>th</sup> 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*

# COMPARISON OF CONTINUOUS AND CELL GRAZING ON BRIGALOW COUNTRY IN CENTRAL QUEENSLAND

*Vanessa Alsemgeest & Bruce Alchin*

DPI Research Station, Roma QLD 4455  
University of Queensland, Gatton QLD 4343

## INTRODUCTION

The use of “cell grazing” (CG) systems in rangelands has attracted significant interest from Australian pastoralists. This study was conducted to compare cell grazing with the conventional continuous grazing (CT) traditionally used in the brigalow country of Central Qld.

## EXPERIMENTAL WORK

The sites studied were comprised of cleared brigalow (*Acacia harpophylla*) country on a property 30 km west of Wandoan. The CG system had been established for 5 years before measurements were taken over a 2 year period (2000-2001). The period of measurement was very dry; the stocking rates (LSU/ha) were:

Year	Continuous Grazing	Cell Grazing
2000	0.46	0.77
2001	0	0.39

The measurements were taken at the end of a rest period on the CG paddock.

## RESULTS/DISCUSSION

The results are summarised in the Tables 1, 2 and 3. Ecosystem Function Analysis indicated the CG ecosystem had a higher level for soil stability, nutrient cycling and infiltration than the CT. There was also a higher plant density under CG. Other data indicated a higher level of available soil moisture and more favourable botanical composition on the CG. Observations suggested that biological activity (particularly dung beetles) was higher on the CG than on the CT. Biological crusts were present only on the CG site.

**Table 1: Ecosystem Function Analysis data – year 1**

Parameter	Continuous Grazing	Cell Grazing
No.obstructions/10 m	12.3	10.3
Total obstruction width (cm/10m)	228.0	301.0
Average fetch length (cm)	49.0	26.0
Perennial grass cover %	39.1	73.1
Stability index (%)	43.3	71.7
Infiltration/runoff index (%)	45.3	58.8
Nutrient cycling index (%)	45.5	54.4

**Table 2: Ecosystem Function Analysis data – year 2**

Parameter	Continuous Grazing	Cell Grazing
No.obstructions/10 m	9.3	22.0
Total obstruction width (cm/10m)	153.3	432.0
Average fetch length (cm)	91.7	31.0
Perennial grass cover %	9.7	26.5
Stability index (%)	35.4	59.3
Infiltration/runoff index (%)	36.8	56.5
Nutrient cycling index (%)	30.5	54.4

**Table 3: Plant density**

Grazing System	Density of Grass Species (no. plants/m <sup>2</sup> )				
	Buffel	Qld blue	Forest blue	Wire	Total
Continuous	9.7	1.6	0	0.8	12.1
Cell	5.6	15.4	0.6	0	21.6

Landscape function analysis indicated the ecosystem had a higher level for soil stability, nutrient cycling and infiltration under the CG compared to the CT. There was also a higher plant density under CG. Other data indicated a higher level of available soil moisture and more favourable botanical composition on the CG. Observations suggested that biological activity (particularly dung beetles) was higher on the CG than on the CT. Biological crusts were present only on the CG site.

The results indicated that CG may provide opportunities for maintenance and improvement of rangeland condition in the brigalow country.

**Acknowledgement:** Thanks to N. & J. Markwell, "Yabba", for their support.