

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**COMPARISON OF TWO METHODS OF
HERBAGE PRODUCTION MEASUREMENT IN
CONTINUOUSLY GRAZED HILL PASTURES**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Agricultural Science in Animal
Science at Massey University New Zealand

Clive Leo Hawkins

1995

ABSTRACT

Hawkins, C. L. 1995. Comparison of two methods of herbage production measurement in continuously grazed hill pastures. M. Ag. Sci. thesis. Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Herbage production of continuously grazed hill country pastures has traditionally been measured using grazing exclusion cages and a trim technique. Herbage production values obtained via this system differ from those of the surrounding grazed sward due to differences in sward structure. Herbage production of four farmlets with differing fertiliser treatments was measured by two methods over a full year. The first method involved a computer model which calculated herbage production from dry matter intake and cover change. Secondly, herbage production was measured via frame cuts, and the results of the two methods compared.

The model measured less herbage production than the frames on an annual basis in all four fertiliser treatments (0.77 of frame average for the four fertiliser treatments). The ratio of model to frame herbage production varied widely during the year, with maximum ratios of model to frame herbage production of 1.6 occurring in autumn, and the minimum of -0.02 in winter.

More herbage was produced under the frames in spring than in the grazed sward as a result of increased expression of reproductive tillers under the frames than in the grazed sward. Frames appear to underestimate herbage production in dry conditions as the trimming off of herbage at the placement of frames leads to lower levels of plant available water when compared to the surrounding sward.

The low ratios are a result of the large amounts of dead material which build up in grazed hill pastures over summer and the rapid breakdown of this material when conditions are right, in this case in early-late winter. The results suggest that there are large differences in the annual, and seasonal pattern of herbage production between that measured off grazed swards and that measured via frames. This suggests that anyone wishing to calculate expected pasture supply using frame cut information must modify frame cut values to determine production of a continuously grazed sward.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would firstly like to thank my two supervisors, Dr. M. Greg Lambert and Dr. Ian M. Brookes for their guidance and encouragement in the undertaking of this study. I am grateful to Dr. Steve T. Morris for his comments on early drafts of this thesis.

I would also like to thank the AgResearch organisation for the opportunity to work in the Biophysical Indicator trial and Dr Dave Barker for providing soil moisture data.

I also need to express my thanks to all the technicians and farm staff involved in help with the collection of data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	I
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	II
LIST OF TABLES.....	IV
LIST OF FIGURES.....	IV
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	V
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	2
2.1 HERBAGE PRODUCTION.....	2
2.1.1 Pasture Growth.....	2
2.1.2 The Effect of Reproductive Growth.....	5
2.1.3 Death and Decay of Herbage.....	7
2.2 DEFOLIATION BY GRAZING ANIMALS.....	9
2.3 COMPENSATORY MECHANISMS IN CONTINUOUSLY GRAZED SWARDS.....	10
2.4 HERBAGE MASS MEASUREMENT.....	12
2.5 HERBAGE PRODUCTION MEASUREMENT.....	13
2.6 FRAME ESTIMATE VERSUS PRODUCTION FROM A CONTINUOUSLY GRAZED SWARD.....	14
2.7 ANIMAL INTAKE.....	16
2.8 THE PREDICTION OF INTAKE VIA COMPUTER MODELS.....	19
2.8.1 The Energy Requirements of Grazing Ruminants.....	20
2.9 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.....	22

3.0 METHOD.....	22
3.1 AREA HISTORY.....	22
3.2 CURRENT TRIAL.....	23
3.2.1 Animal Measurements.....	24
3.2.2 Pasture Measurements.....	25
3.3 SPREADSHEET MODEL.....	26
3.4 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS.....	28
3.5 PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT IN MEASUREMENTS MADE.....	29
4.0 RESULTS.....	29
4.1 RATIO OF MODEL TO FRAME CUT	29
4.2 HERBAGE PRODUCTION MEASURED BY FRAME CUTS.....	30
4.3 HERBAGE PRODUCTION VIA THE MODEL.....	32
4.4 ANIMAL INTAKE AND COVER CHANGE.....	32
4.5 HERBAGE QUALITY MEASUREMENTS.....	39
4.6 ANIMAL PRODUCTION.....	39
4.7 BOTANICAL COMPOSITION.....	39
5.0 DISCUSSION.....	40
5.1 RATIO OF MODEL TO FRAME MEASUREMENTS.....	40
5.2 THE EFFECT OF FERTILITY, ASPECT AND SLOPE.....	44
5.3 PASTURE QUALITY.....	45
6.0 CONCLUSIONS.....	46
7.0 REFERENCES.....	47
APPENDIX 1.....	59

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1, Page 31** Ratios of model to frame cut data for the four fertiliser treatments and their average, and for slope and aspect measured over the four fertiliser treatments, across 7 cut intervals and for the annual total.
- Table 2, Page 31** Pasture production measured using frame cuts (kgDM/ha/day) for fertiliser treatments, and for slopes and aspects measured across the fertiliser treatments, plus annual totals (kgDM/ha).
- Table 3, Page 33** Pasture production calculated from the model (kgDM/ha/day) for fertiliser treatments and for slopes and aspects measured across the fertiliser treatments, plus annual totals (kgDM/ha).

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1, Page 35** Pasture production for cut interval 1 (7/10-16/11/93)
- Figure 2, Page 35** Pasture production for cut interval 2 (16/11-16/12/93)
- Figure 3, Page 36** Pasture production for cut interval 3 (16/12-3/2/94)
- Figure 4, Page 36** Pasture production for cut interval 4 (3/2-7/4/94)
- Figure 5, Page 37** Pasture production for cut interval 5 (7/4-22/6/94)
- Figure 6, Page 37** Pasture production for cut interval 6 (22/6-8/9/94)
- Figure 7, Page 38** Pasture production for cut interval 7 (8/9-7/10/94)
- Figure 8, Page 38** Pasture production estimates for the year 7/10/93-7/10/94

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

%	percentage
°	degree
°C	degree Celsius
CH ₂ O	carbohydrate
cm	centimetre
d	day
DM	dry matter
DMD	dry matter digestibility
<i>et al</i>	and others
ha	hectare
HFRO	hill farming research organisation
ie.	that is to say
kg	kilogram
LAI	leaf area index
M/D	MJME/kg/DM
ME	metabolisable energy
MJ	megajoule
mm	millimetre
m ²	square meter
N	nitrogen
P	phosphate
<i>pers comm</i>	personal communication
<i>pers obs</i>	personal observation
SSH	sward surface height
su	stock unit