

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/29467968>

# Comparing the effects of continuous and time-controlled grazing systems on soil characteristics in Southeast Queensland

Article in *Australian Journal of Soil Research* · January 2008

DOI: 10.1071/SR07220 · Source: OAI

CITATIONS

66

READS

655

4 authors, including:



**Gholamreza Sanjari**

Ministry of agriculture, Tehran, Iran

9 PUBLICATIONS 109 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



**Hossein Ghadiri**

Griffith University

113 PUBLICATIONS 2,063 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



**Bofu Yu**

Griffith University

159 PUBLICATIONS 3,846 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Environment water: principles, practices and outcomes [View project](#)



1 **Abstract:**

2

3 Grazing by livestock has a great influence on soil characteristics with major effects on  
4 soil carbon and nitrogen cycling in grazing lands. Grazing practices affect soil properties  
5 in different ways depending on the prescribed stocking rate and grazing periods. The new  
6 grazing system of short intensive grazing followed by a long period of rest referred to as  
7 time-controlled grazing (TC grazing) has become popular amongst many graziers in  
8 Australia and elsewhere in the world. However, little research has been carried out on the  
9 impacts of this grazing system on the physical and chemical health of the soil. To address  
10 this issue, a comprehensive field study was carried out in a sheep grazing property of  
11 Currajong in south east region of Queensland, Australia where the two grazing systems of  
12 continuous and TC grazing were compared. Results obtained on the impact of grazing  
13 management on soil characteristics over a five-year period (2001 – 2006) showed an  
14 increase in soil organic carbon (SOC) and nitrogen (SON) in the areas with favorable soil  
15 condition over the study period as compared with continuous grazing. There was also an  
16 increase in ground litter accumulation over time and no compaction in TC grazing.  
17 Nitrate and extractable P concentrations were reduced by higher grass growth occurring  
18 under TC grazing, which in turn decreases the contamination potential for downstream  
19 water bodies. This reduction was much more pronounced on a historical sheep  
20 aggregation camp turned into TC system, where a large amount of fecal materials had  
21 been deposited prior to the its conversion to TC grazing. The smaller size of the paddocks  
22 along with the long rest period provided by TC grazing in this area recognized to be the

1 major contributors to both physical and chemical recovery of the soil after each grazing  
2 operation.

3 **Key words:**

4 bulk density, ground litter, organic matter, organic carbon, organic nitrogen, extractable

5 P, NO<sub>3</sub>-N

6

1 **Introduction:**

2

3 Grazing practices are recognized as the key drivers to manage and control soil quality in  
4 grazing lands. Sustainable utilization of grazing lands requires management strategies  
5 that do not compromise the capacity of soil to function over the long-term (Liebig et al.  
6 2006). Depending on the ecosystem resilience and disturbance feedback, grazing causes  
7 either positive or negative effects on soil properties (Franzluebbers and Stuedemann  
8 2003).

9

10 A system of flexible, high-intensity, short period grazing followed by a long period of  
11 rest (HI-SG) was first put forward by Savory in 1978 (Savory and Parsons, 1980) and  
12 was later introduced to Australia in 1989 by Stan Parsons as “Cell Grazing” (McCosker  
13 2000). The terms of “The Savory Grazing System”, “Short Duration Grazing” and more  
14 specifically in this paper “Time-controlled Grazing” are the common names of the new  
15 grazing system. Time-controlled grazing (TC grazing) has been increasingly popular  
16 amongst graziers in Australia and the rest of the world over the past two decades.  
17 However, little research has been carried out on the impacts of this grazing system on the  
18 soil physical and chemical characteristics.

19 Soil organic matter (SOM) is regarded as a major determinant of ecosystem health and  
20 stability and the largest reservoir of carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) in most grazing land  
21 ecosystems (Brady and Weil 1999; Kumar and Goh 2000; Follett 2001). It provides a  
22 primary source of many plant nutrients, improves the water-holding capacity of soil and  
23 is responsible for the formation of stable aggregates that protect the soil from erosion. In

1 recent years, increase in SOM to achieve higher and sustainable productivity in grazing  
2 lands is not the only objective for changing grazing strategies as it is now increasingly  
3 recognized as a solution to global warming through the sequestration of a large amount of  
4 atmospheric carbon dioxide into the soil organic carbon pool (Lal 2003).

5 Studies on soil organic carbon (SOC) and nitrogen (SON) accumulation in response to  
6 grazing management have been mostly focused on different types of continuous grazing  
7 under a variety of stocking rates. The results of such studies are inconsistent with some  
8 showing a decrease (Bauer et al. 1987; Frank et al. 1995; Derner et al. 1997), no change  
9 (Milchunas and Lauenroth 1993; Kieft 1994; Manley et al. 1995; Mathews et al. 1996),  
10 or increase (Ruess and Mcnaughton 1987; Dormaar et al. 1990; Dormaar and Willms  
11 1990a) in SOC and SON under different grazing intensity. Changes in SOC and N under  
12 TC grazing however have not been well researched. Southorn (2002) is probably the only  
13 researcher who reported some increase in SOM under TC grazing and attributed it to a  
14 larger proportion of plant material being trampled, broken down, and incorporated into  
15 soil by livestock.

16

17 A high rate of SOM decomposition that eventually decreases SOC and N is attributed to  
18 intensive grazing involving excessive trampling which occurs more frequently under  
19 continuous grazing with high stocking rates (Theron 1955; Du Preez and Snyman 1993).  
20 Grazing-induced nutrient accumulation in soils, whilst desirable for increasing pasture  
21 production, has the potential of causing environmental concerns through washing off and  
22 leaching the contaminants to downstream water bodies (Correll 1996; Sharpley et al.  
23 1996). This adverse impact on water quality may occur either through the rapid

1 mineralization of organic material or imbalanced distribution of urine and faeces in  
2 paddocks due to the establishment of animal aggregation camps. These camp sites, which  
3 threaten downstream water quality, are more likely to occur in large paddocks under  
4 continuous grazing where animals are allowed to graze more selectively and deposit  
5 nutrients in some specific areas of the paddock. Small paddocks however are known to be  
6 more evenly grazed with evenly distributed urine and manure (Haynes and Williams  
7 1993; Mueller and Green 1995). Time-controlled grazing which is basically carried out in  
8 a large number of small paddocks is therefore expected to contribute to more uniform  
9 distribution of urine and faeces across the paddocks by modifying animal aggregation  
10 behavior and camp sites development. However no study has been carried out to test such  
11 a hypothesis.

12

13 The impact of grazing systems on soil physical characteristics such as bulk density and  
14 compaction is another aspect of this investigation. Grazing-induced compaction affects  
15 soil bulk density at different rates depending on the amount of available plant residue on  
16 the ground (Rodd et al., 1999; da Silva et al., 2003). Bulk density and porosity in turn  
17 affect water and aeration status of the soil, as well as root penetration and development.  
18 They are therefore important soil physical properties to be monitored on grazing lands.  
19 Bulk density is also inversely related to the SOM (da Silva et al. 1997; Gifford and  
20 Roderick 2003) and their interaction can become an important factor in the effectiveness  
21 of grazing systems.

22 Time-controlled grazing has been shown to improve soil physical condition through  
23 converting the above-ground organic matter to litter without causing soil compaction

1 (Goodloe 1969) and to increase the abundance of micro-arthropods in the 0 – 10 cm soil  
2 depth (Tom et al. 2006). However, Dormaar et al. (1989) reported that TC grazing had a  
3 negative effect on bulk density, due to compaction by grazing animals. This anomaly  
4 highlights that further studies are clearly needed.

5

6 This paper is based on the results of a large scale field experiment carried out over a 5  
7 years period on a grazing paddock in southeast Queensland. The effects of the two  
8 grazing systems of TC and continuous on the physical (bulk density and ground litter)  
9 and chemical (SOC, SON,  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and extractable P) properties of soils are reported in this  
10 paper. The hypothesis tested in this study is that the TC grazing system significantly  
11 improves physical and chemical properties of grazing land soils, over the continuous  
12 grazing system, by reducing soil bulk density, incorporating ground litter into the top soil,  
13 and increasing TOC and SON.

14



1 **Methods:**

2

3 ***Study sites***

4 The study area is located on the property of Currajong 40 km west of Stanthorpe in a  
5 semi-arid region of southeast Queensland Australia (28° 33' S, 151° 33' E , altitude 675  
6 m) in the headwaters of Treverton Creek in the Murray-Darling Basin. Long term mean  
7 annual rainfall is 645 mm with dominant summer rain (70 percent falling in the six  
8 months of October - March). Rain in the dry season (Mar - Sep) is characterised by  
9 relatively small events both in magnitude and intensity associated with frontal  
10 depressions, while in the wet period, there is a high frequency of moderate to large events  
11 of short duration thunder storms and long duration cyclonic depressions.

12

13 Vegetation in the area is native perennial grasses dominated mostly by Queensland blue  
14 grass [*Dichanthium sericem* (R. Br.) A. Camus], different wire grasses including Aristida  
15 vegans and Barbed wire grass [*Cymbopogon refractus* (R.Br.) A.Camus] plus some  
16 remnant native gum trees. Coolatai [*Hyparrhenia hirta* (L.) Stapf] as an introduced  
17 perennial grass is spreading throughout this area.

18

19 Soils in the study area are mostly clay to clay loam in texture (Table 1). Geology  
20 comprises part of the Warroo land system, generally referred to as Traprock. This is a  
21 complex mixture of highly deformed sandstone, mudstone, inter-bedded conglomerate,  
22 limestone and volcanics (Maher, 1996). Geomorphologic characteristics of lands in this  
23 region have been described by Wills (1979).

1

## 2 *Treatments*

3

4 This research was conducted on a commercial pasture property which was in the process  
5 of converting from long term continuous grazing system to TC grazing. It thus provided  
6 us with an opportunity to study the impacts of the new grazing system on soil, water,  
7 vegetation, nutrient and sediment changes in comparison with continuous grazing. In this  
8 paper our focus is only on the soil responses to these two methods of grazing.

9

10 The application of TC grazing system required the large paddocks in the property to be  
11 sub-divided into a number of smaller paddocks (cells) using electric fences. Two such  
12 cells ranging in area from 84 to 250 hectares were used for this experiment; one for TC  
13 grazing and the other for continuous grazing. The paddocks assigned to the grazing  
14 treatments were divided each into two sections based on the physiographic features of the  
15 land (slope and soil depth) (Table 1). C1 and C2 under TC grazing, and C3 and C4 under  
16 continuous grazing, are here forth called sub-treatments. There were also some  
17 physiographic similarities between C1 and C4 on the one hand and between C2 and C3  
18 on the other hand, which have been useful when comparing the two grazing methods.

Approximate position of table 1
---------------------------------

19

20 A total of 52 permanent sampling sites were allocated to the treatments, of which 8 sites  
21 were on the non-grazed treatment and the rest were equally distributed between the four  
22 sub-treatments of C1 to C4 located in a down-slope catenary sequence to cover all land

1 form components. These sites were used for periodic sampling of soil and ground litter  
2 during the 5 years life of the project.

3

4 Stocking rate, grazing duration and rest periods in TC grazing were adjusted according  
5 to the feed on offer and grass growth rate and therefore were subject to change between  
6 the cells. Maximum efforts were made to keep the stock numbers close to the optimum  
7 stocking rate (as decided by the grazier) within the cells. The stocking rates for the two  
8 management treatments are expressed as a dry sheep equivalent (dse), and given in Table  
9 2. In continuous grazing, a fixed stocking rate of around 1.6 dse/ha was applied for the  
10 whole year.

11

Approximate position of table 2
---------------------------------

12

### 13 *Sample analysis*

14

15 Ground litter and bulk density samples were randomly collected from around the  
16 permanent sampling sites using a 0.25 m<sup>2</sup> quadrat and a long tube soil corer (44 mm in  
17 diameter). For the soil depth, it was assumed that the top 10 cm of soil profile contained  
18 the highest amount of organic material and this layer was most likely to change in  
19 response to different grazing managements (Du Preez and Snyman 1993; Paul and Clark  
20 1996). Composite samples were taken from the top 10 cm, oven dried at 40 °C, passed  
21 through a 2 mm sieve to remove plant material and stored at 4 °C. These samples were  
22 used for the measurement of soil TOC, TON, NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, PO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> as well as pH, EC and

1 texture. EC and pH were measured in a 1:5 soil/water suspension (Rayment and  
2 Higginson 1992) and for soil particle size analysis, the hydrometer method was used  
3 (Kim 1996).

4

5 Total soil organic carbon (TOC) was measured using the rapid wet oxidation method  
6 (Walkley and Black 1934) modified by Sims (1976). In this method SOC content, after  
7 oxidizing by potassium dichromate and sulfuric acid, was calculated from the amount of  
8 chromic ion ( $\text{Cr}^{3+}$ ) formed using a colorimetric procedure measuring absorbance at 588  
9 nm.

10

11 Total soil organic nitrogen was determined with a semimicro-kjeldahl procedure  
12 (Bremner, 1996). This involved sample digestion by concentrated sulfuric acid in the  
13 presence of a copper sulfate catalyst and potassium sulfate using a block digester  
14 followed by a colorimetric determination of  $\text{NH}_4^+$  in the digests (Lachat, 1992). SON was  
15 the difference between Kjeldahl-N and residual  $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$ . For the measurement of  
16 inorganic nitrogen ( $\text{NO}_3^-$  and  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ), 2M KCL solution was used for extraction, with a  
17 1:10 ratio of soil to extractant (Bremner and Keeney, 1966). The mixture was shaken for  
18 1 hour then centrifuged at 2000 rpm for 20 minutes and filtered through a Whatman 42  
19 filter paper and analyzed using an autoanalyzer (Lachat, 2001). Orthophosphate  
20 extraction was performed using Colwell method (Colwell, 1963) which is a modification  
21 of the original bicarbonate procedure (Olson et al., 1954) that employs an extracting  
22 solution of 0.5M  $\text{NaHCO}_3$  adjusted to pH 8.5. The extracted phosphorous was

1 determined calorimetrically by a molybdate blue method (Murphy and Riley 1962) using  
2 an auto analyzer procedure.

3

#### 4 *Statistical analyses*

5

6 All statistical comparisons in this paper are based on 90% confident interval using SPSS  
7 14 package; however p-values beyond the significant levels are also reported. Analysis of  
8 variance was used to test SOC, SON, nitrate, extractable p, mulch and bulk density  
9 changes over time (2001 to 2006) in different treatments (TC grazing, continuous grazing  
10 and no grazed) and Sub-treatments (C1, C2, C3 and C4). Pearson correlation analysis was  
11 performed to test the changes in residue and bulk density over the time.

12

### 13 **Results and Discussion:**

14

#### 15 *Effect of grazing methods on residue accumulation and bulk density*

16

17 Ground litter accumulation was increased significantly under TC grazing as compared  
18 with continuous grazing. Both C1 and C2 (TC grazing) showed highly significant  
19 differences in mulch accumulation through time. In contrast, for the continuous grazing  
20 sub-treatments, only C4 showed a positive mulch accumulation and C3 did not change  
21 over the time (Table 3). Increased ground litter accumulation under TC grazing is  
22 attributed to the significant enhancement of aboveground pasture production over time  
23 which is presented later.

1 Based on the correlation between residue accumulation and time, a linear regression  
2 model is presented in Table 3 for estimation of ground litter mass at any time over the  
3 course of the study which may have application in vegetation-runoff studies under natural  
4 events.

5

Approximate position of table 3

6

7 The results on bulk density indicate a significant increase under C3 of continuous grazing  
8 ( $p \leq 0.1$ ) but remained constant under all other treatments (Table 4). Similar results were  
9 shown by another set of bulk density comparisons using soil cores taken at fixed times,  
10 during the first and the last years of the trial, thus allowing investigation of possible  
11 seasonal effect. The fixed-time comparison include samples taken on May 2001, Nov  
12 2001 and July 2002 as the first year of the experiment which was repeated on July 2005,  
13 Nov 2005 and May 2006 as the last year of experiment (Table 4). These results indicate  
14 that soil compaction can take place under continuous grazing but not under TC grazing.  
15 Bulk density in TC grazing remained unaffected (C2 & C1).

Approximate position of table 4

16

17 Lower soil compaction and damage under TC grazing in this area is basically attributed  
18 to the higher accumulation of ground litter over time. Ohu et al. 1985; Gupta et al. 1987;  
19 Wheeler et al. (2002) and Da Silva et al. (2003) reported that the presence of an organic  
20 top layer, dissipates the force of animal hooves on soil surface resulting in less  
21 compaction and lower bulk density of the soil underneath, which appears to be the case in

1 this study. Soil bulk density has been found to increase in soils with a high quantity of  
2 fine soil particles (clay + silt) which make them more sensitive to animal traffic and  
3 compaction (Vanhaveren 1983; Abdelmagid et al. 1987). The soils of our experimental  
4 paddocks were fine in texture, mostly of clay to clay loam type. Thus the compaction  
5 observed in C3 was probably more due to the grazing management which left insufficient  
6 litter on the ground to protect the soil surface from animal traffic and compaction.

7

8 Under the no-grazing treatment, ground litter was accumulated ( $p = 0.11$ ) over the time,  
9 which is in agreement with Su (2003) **however** the lack of grazing animals to break it  
10 down and incorporate into the top soil, resulted in a reduction in soil organic carbon and  
11 nitrogen and no change in soil bulk density.

12

### 13 ***Soil TOC and TON responses to the grazing treatments***

14

15 As illustrated in Fig 1a & 1b an overall noticeable increase occurred in TOC ( $p = 0.16$ )  
16 and to a lesser extent in TON ( $p = 0.29$ ) under TC grazing treatment from 2001 to 2006,  
17 but not at statistically significant level. Over the same period, no changes were observed  
18 in these variables under continuous grazing treatment.

Approximate position of Figure 1

19

20 The results of the sub-treatments (Fig 2a & 2b), showed more variation in soil responses  
21 to TC and continuous grazing systems, depending on differences in geomorphology  
22 features of land and soil properties. Under TC grazing, C1 showed a significant increase

1 in TOC ( $p \leq 0.10$ ) and TON ( $p = 0.18$ ) over the time however, but this factor remained  
2 constant under C2. On the other hand, continuous grazing under C4 experienced small  
3 increase in soil carbon ( $p = 0.31$ ) and nitrogen ( $p = 0.39$ ) while in C3 showed a small  
4 decline in SOC ( $p = 0.33$ ) and no change in SON.

Approximate position of Figure 2

5

6 It appears that the 6 years period of this study hasn't been long enough to clearly show  
7 the difference between the two methods of grazing for all the factors considered.  
8 However the results clearly indicate a relative increase in SOM through time under TC  
9 grazing over the continuous grazing. The main reasons for such an increase in SOM  
10 under TC grazing system appears to be the higher rate of grass growth and longer rest  
11 periods. The same two factors also contributed to the higher accumulation of ground litter  
12 under TC grazing, which was reported earlier.. These results appear to be consistent with  
13 those of Southorn (2002). He attributed the accumulated soil carbon to the larger  
14 proportion of plant material being incorporated into the soil under TC grazing over  
15 continuous grazing. Gillen et al. (1991) suggested that the long period of rest is a key  
16 driver in the recovery of grazed species and this has played a major role to substantially  
17 increase the above ground organic material followed by its subsequent incorporation into  
18 the soil resulting in increased SOM.

19

20 Root decay, even though not measured in this experiment, appears to be another reason  
21 for increasing SOM under TC grazing. It has been reported that the intensive defoliation  
22 under a single grazing event after a rest period (common in TC grazing), results in



1 ceasing respiration leading to the death of a large amount of roots within a few hours  
2 after grazing in order to equalize the biomass (Richards 1993). The quantity of root  
3 pruned in this way depends on grazing intensity and the total root mass which is the main  
4 source of below ground soil organic matter (Jones 2000). Root mass which is mostly  
5 reported to be more than twice that of above-ground biomass (Ross 1977; Hall and Lee  
6 1980; Christie 1981; Montani et al. 1996) provides a large amount of vertically oriented  
7 pores after dying off, facilitating better infiltration.

8

9 Less animals treading under TC grazing have probably had a positive indirect effect on  
10 soil carbon and nitrogen providing a faster soil physical and biological recovery  
11 following each grazing period. Abdelmagid et al. (1987) showed the maximum distance  
12 traveled by grazing animals under continuous grazing is around 4.8 km/day, while this  
13 distance under the short period grazing (i.e. TC grazing) is 1.6 km/day for the same  
14 stocking rate. Taking the average hoof print size of the grazing animal into  
15 consideration, the above figures suggest that around 22% of the pasture area is trampled  
16 on under the continuous grazing system while this fraction is only 7% for TC grazing.

17

18 The results of sub-treatment comparisons appear to indicate that TC grazing causes larger  
19 increase in soil carbon and nitrogen over time as compared with continuous grazing when  
20 the soil physical properties are relatively favorable (C1 vs. C4). Conversely, when the  
21 soil is shallow or on a steep slope, as it's the case for C2 and C3, SOC tend to decline in  
22 continuous grazing (C3) while TC grazing appeared to maintain its level of SOC over the  
23 time (C2).

1 The increased SOC in TC grazing treatment reported in this study has an added  
2 dimension of carbon sequestration. Our results show that on average 1.37 ton/ha extra  
3 carbon is locked up in the top 10cm of the soil under TC grazing compared with the  
4 continuous grazing . This figure was as high as 3.13 tons/ha in C1 where the soil  
5 condition was more favorable for plant growth and SOC increased significantly over  
6 time.

7

8 The enclosures, which were kept ungrazed for the entire 6 years period of the study,  
9 experienced a slight decline in both soil carbon and nitrogen over time (Figures 1a & 1b).

10 While this decline over time is not statistically significant, the trend shows a possible  
11 negative effect of long term animal exclusion on soil organic matter. Grazing animals  
12 appear to positively contributing to nutrient cycling, plant growth, and soil biological  
13 activities of the paddock. Increased ground litter in the enclosures zone as compared  
14 with the grazed areas is can be the reason for the decline in soil organic matter in this  
15 zone since they would not be trampled on, broken down and incorporated with the top  
16 soil by grazing animals.. Under non-grazed treatment, another part of plant residue  
17 referred to as standing residue also does not contribute to soil organic materials. This  
18 fraction which accounts for 8 – 16% of the total above ground dry matter in our  
19 experiment is possibly one of the reasons for the reduction of SOC and SON in the  
20 ungrazed area. The important role of grazing animals in converting surface litter into  
21 SOC and incorporating it with the top soil has also been reported by Naeth et al. (1991).  
22 Schuman (1999) also reported a reduction in soil organic carbon and nitrogen in soils  
23 under grazing exclusion zones as compared with grazed areas.

1

2 *Effects of grazing on soil C:N ratio, available nitrogen and phosphorus*

3

4 The C:N ratio of soil organic matter varied between the treatments and over time, ranging  
5 from 11 to 15 (Fig 3). This ratio increased slightly over time in soils under TC grazing  
6 treatment, which was more noticeable in C1 ( $p = 0.26$ ). A similar level of increase is  
7 observed in un-grazed treatment ( $p = 0.21$ ). In contrast, the C:N ratio declined (C3) or  
8 remained unchanged (C4) under continuous grazing treatment. The C:N ratio remained  
9 unaffected over time in the less productive paddocks of C2 from TC grazing and C4 from  
10 continuous grazing. None of the above changes are statistically significant, suggesting  
11 that a longer period of study might be required for the effect of treatments on C:N ratio to  
12 become unequivocal. C:N ratio as an indicator of soil mineralization (Vallejo 1993) has  
13 been reported to increase in grazing lands with good management and decrease in the  
14 soils with poor management (Theron 1955; Du Preez and Snyman 1993). It has been also  
15 shown that excessive trampling decreases soil C:N ratio through more finely breaking  
16 down the organic material facilitating better litter-soil contact and more rapid  
17 decomposition by microorganisms (Naeth et al. 1991), which eventually decreases soil  
18 organic carbon and nitrogen resources.

19

Approximate position of Figure 3

20

21 The results of soil available nitrogen measurement revealed a sharp significant decrease  
22 in  $\text{NO}_3^-$  concentration in C1 and non-grazed treatments and to a lesser extent in C2 and

1 C4 during the study period ( $p \leq 0.01$ )(Fig 4c). However, nitrate concentration increased  
2 significantly under continuous grazing in C3 ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) which is consistent with the  
3 results of Baron et al. (2001), Haynes and Williams (1993) and Whitehead (1995). The  
4 ratio of  $\text{NO}_3\text{:TON}$  which shows the soil nitrate as a proportion of total organic nitrogen  
5 pool, declined significantly in 2006 as compared to 2001 by a factor of 14, 1.3, 2.2 and  
6 23 in C1, C2, C4 and no grazed enclosures respectively. However, this ratio increased in  
7 C3 by a factor of 2 ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) (Fig 4b).

8

Approximate position of Figure 4

9

10 A marked reduction in soil nitrate concentration in C1 (Fig 4c) along with an increase in  
11 C:N ratio (Fig 3) over time probably indicate that nitrogen and carbon immobilization by  
12 plants and micro-organisms have been the dominant process over mineralization,  
13 contributing to the higher soil organic matter accumulation under TC grazing practice (Fig  
14 1). In continuous grazing treatment however, decrease in the C:N ratio and increase in  
15  $\text{NO}_3\text{:TON}$  ratio under C3 indicates that mineralization has been probably the dominant  
16 process resulting in a decrease in soil organic matter.

17

18 Soils from the non-grazed treatment showed the lowest nitrate concentration (0.17 mg/kg  
19 soil) after 5 years of grazing exclusion (Fig 4c) which is in agreement with the findings of  
20 Dormaar et al. (1990). This result, along with the small reduction in soil organic matter  
21 reported earlier, indicate that the grazing animals may play an important role in nutrient  
22 cycling and pasture fertility. Grazing animals use only a small proportion of the nutrient

1 they ingest and 60- 99% of the ingested nutrients are returned to the pasture in the form  
2 of dung and urine (Barrow 1987). Therefore a pasture with long term grazing exclusion is  
3 subject to a lower productivity through decline in available soil nutrients. Unlike nitrate  
4 which declined under grazing exclusion (Fig 4c), soil ammonium concentration  
5 increased significantly from 4.56 in 2001 to 13.69 mg/kg in 2006. This result supports the  
6 concept that  $\text{NH}_4^+$  concentration increases from a minimum in the first successional stage  
7 to a maximum in the climax and vice versa for  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  (Rice 1984). In other words, under  
8 grassland ecosystems when herbivores are left out of pasture for a long time, soil  
9 available nitrogen is kept more in the form of ammonium which is less subject to  
10 leaching than nitrate.

11

12 Extractable P fell markedly in all treatments over the study period ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) (Fig 4a) at  
13 different rates. This reduction occurred by a factor of 3.5 under TC grazing and 1.3 under  
14 continuous grazing treatments. Decrease in extractable P under TC grazing can be an  
15 indication of higher P uptake by plants, thus producing better ground litter cover and  
16 higher P lock up. As phosphorous is excreted only in faeces by animals and is not mobile  
17 (Haynes and Williams 1993), losses of organic P through water erosion might be the  
18 main reason for the decrease in the extractable P concentration under continuous grazing.

19

### 20 ***Effect of the grazing methods on animal aggregation camps***

21

22 Grazing practices appear to reduce and control animal aggregation behavior which leads  
23 to an imbalance distribution of faeces and urine across the paddocks that is potentially of

1 environmental concern for the contamination of downstream water bodies. Unlike  
2 continuous grazing, TC grazing practice which encourages livestock to graze more  
3 uniformly and therefore deposit feces and urine more evenly throughout the paddocks is  
4 expected to reduce the possibility of animal aggregation camp establishment. To ascertain  
5 the extent to which TC grazing can reduce the negative effects of animal aggregation  
6 camp, a large hilltop sheep camping site was identified within the area converted to TC  
7 grazing in 2001. A long soil sampling transect which passed through this site was  
8 identified and nitrate and extractable P were measured on the samples taken along this  
9 transect. This sampling and sample analysis were carried out on May 2001 and repeated  
10 on May 2006 (only the samples taken from the top 10 cm of soil were analysed). As  
11 shown in fig 5 nitrate and extractable P concentrations decreases with distance from the  
12 sheep camp in both 2001 and 2006. The result highlights the large amount of nutrients  
13 available on sheep camp on 2001 and the subsequent levels in 2006, as compared with  
14 the immediate surrounding areas of the transect. Moreover, the high levels of nitrate and  
15 available P concentration measured in 2001, as representative of the long term sheep  
16 aggregation under continuous grazing, dropped markedly in 2006, some 5 years after its  
17 conversion to TC grazing.

18

Approximate position of Figure 5

19

20 The large amount of nutrient consumed by Couch grass [*Agropyron repense* (L.)  
21 P.Beauv] as the dominant sheep camp's vegetation over the rest periods is probably the  
22 first reason for the reduction of nitrate and extractable P concentrations in the soil

1 solution with time. This grass under TC grazing has an exceptional opportunity for a  
2 rapid re-growth producing high amount of palatable herbage after each grazing period  
3 soon after the soil moisture condition becomes favorable. An example of 2650 and 3685  
4 kg/ha dry matter re-growth recorded in our experiment within 16 and 60 days rest periods  
5 respectively show clearly the ability of this grass to take up large quantities of the  
6 available nutrients from the camping site over the rest periods. Under continuous grazing  
7 however, the yearlong presence of animals in the paddock inhibit such a re-growth  
8 resulting in less nutrient consumption by the vegetation. The second reason is the effect  
9 of smaller paddock size under TC grazing compared with continuous grazing, which  
10 reduces the uneven distribution of the fecal materials across the paddocks (Haynes and  
11 Williams 1993; Mueller and Green 1995).

12

13 According to Ewanek (1995) and Johnson and Eckert (1995), concern about losses of P  
14 and N by overland flow and the resulting contamination of down stream water, arises  
15 when nitrate and available P concentrations in soil profiles exceed 160 kg/ha and 330  
16 kg/ha respectively. The total available nutrient measured from the soil profile inside the  
17 camp showed the concentration of nitrate decreased sharply from 126 in 2001 to 17.6  
18 kg/ha in 2006 and similarly available P declined from 222 in 2001 to 79.3 kg/ha in 2006.  
19 Although the results indicate that the nutrient concentrations obtained in 2001 in  
20 particular for nitrate are a little below the thresholds quoted by Ewanek and Johnson  
21 nevertheless, the environmental concerns about continuous grazing still remain, as many  
22 animal aggregation sites are normally established around feed lots, water trough and in  
23 unproductive areas where no vegetation exists to uptake even minimum amounts of

1 available nutrients. On the other hand, much lower nutrient concentrations measured on  
2 2006 under the sheep camp, once again showed that TC grazing is able to reduce the  
3 animal aggregation behavior, which in turn significantly decreases the potential for the  
4 contamination of downstream water bodies.

5

### 6 ***Effect of grazing methods on herbage production***

7

8 A full report on the results of our investigation into the impact of grazing methods on  
9 herbage mass and grazing land production is beyond the scope of this paper. As the paper  
10 concentrates on the impact of grazing on soil characteristics however some of the results  
11 obtained on herbage production are given in fig 6 as further supporting evidence for the  
12 overall superiority in herbage production of TC grazing over continuous grazing in the  
13 region, and to show that the noticeable improvement in the physical and chemical  
14 properties of soil under TC grazing translates directly into higher herbage production. Fig  
15 6 shows the changes of herbage production under the two grazing management systems  
16 over time. Although herbage mass accumulation is strongly influenced by the variation in  
17 rainfall, TC grazing has shown a relatively higher overall trend (dotted line) of herbage  
18 mass compared with continuous grazing through time. This aspect of the research work is  
19 still in progress and the full results, once completed, will be presented separately.

20

Approximate position of Figure 6

21

22



1 **Conclusion**

2

3 Time-controlled grazing which involves short periods of intensive grazing followed by  
4 long rest periods under a flexible regeme, increases above ground organic materials and  
5 protects the soil from hoof damage over continuous grazing in the region. This practice  
6 also reduces the potential for contamination of downstream water quality through up  
7 taking by grass of larger quantities of soluble nutrients. In relation to soil carbon, TC  
8 grazing increases soil organic materials significantly only in the areas with a better soil  
9 characteristic however, longer time period of monitoring may be needed to draw firm  
10 conclusion about the positive impact of TC on SOC. Continuous grazing which excludes  
11 rest periods however increases soil damage through reducing soil protection caused by  
12 less above ground organic material accumulation and more frequent trampling. Sheep  
13 aggregation camps under continuous grazing are more of environmental concern when  
14 they are established in unproductive areas with no vegetation. In summary the results of  
15 this study appear to suggest that TC grazing, under the prevailing conditions of the study  
16 area, is superior to the continuous grazing as far as improving physical and chemical  
17 quality of soil, organic material and nutrient accumulation and plant re-growth are  
18 concerned. However, a longer period of data collection is needed for the differences  
19 between the two grazing practices become more pronounced or statistically significant.

20

1 **Acknowledgements**

2

3 This work was supported by the government of Iran to G. Sanjari and grant from the  
4 Natural Heritage Trust to C. Ciesiolka. We thank Rick and Louise Goodrich, the owners  
5 of the property for their supports and Mr. Eugene Creek for his voluntarily assistance in  
6 field works.

7

8

9

10

1 **References:**

- 2 Abdelmagid AH, Schuman GE, Hart RH (1987) Soil bulk density and water infiltration  
3 as affected by grazing systems. *Journal of Range Management* **40**, 307-309.  
4
- 5 Abdelmagid AH, Trlica MJ, Hart RH (1987a) Soil and vegetation responses to simulated  
6 trampling. *Journal of Range Management* **40**, 303–306.  
7
- 8 Baron VS, Dick AC, Mapfumo E, Malhi SS, Naeth MA, Chanasyk DS (2001) Grazing  
9 impacts on soil nitrogen and phosphorus under Parkland pastures. *Journal of Range*  
10 *Management* **54**, 704-710.  
11
- 12 Barrow NJ (1987) Nutrient Cycling: Return of nutrients by animals In 'Managed  
13 Grasslands'. (Ed. RW Snaydon) pp. 181 - 186. (Elsevier: Oxford, England).  
14
- 15 Bauer A, Cole CV, Black AL (1987) Soil property comparisons in virgin grasslands  
16 between grazed and non-grazed management systems. *Soil Science Society of America*  
17 *Journal* **51**, 176 - 182.  
18
- 19 Brady NC, Weil RR (1999) Soil organic matter. In 'The nature and properties of soils'.  
20 (Eds NC Brady, RR Weil) pp. 446 - 490. (Prentice Hall: New Jersey).  
21
- 22 Bremner JM (1996) Nitrogen-Total In 'Methods of soil analysis. Part 3 Chemical  
23 Methods'. (Ed. DL Sparks). (Soil Science Society of America: Madison Wisconsin,  
24 USA).  
25
- 26 Bremner JM, Keeney DR (1966) Determination and isotope-ratio analysis of different  
27 forms of nitrogen in soils: 3. Exchangeable ammonium, nitrate, and nitrite by extraction-  
28 distillation method. *Soil Science Society of America Proceeding* **30**, 577 - 582.  
29
- 30 Christie EK (1981) Biomass and nutrient dynamics in a C4 semi-arid Australian  
31 grassland community. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **18**, 907 - 918.  
32
- 33 Colwell JD (1963) The estimation of the phosphorus fertilizer requirements of wheat in  
34 southern New South Wales by soil analysis. *Australian Journal of Experimental*  
35 *Agriculture and Animal Husbandry* **3**, 190 - 198.  
36

- 1 Correll DL (1996) Environmental impact of pasture systems on surface water quality. In  
2 'Nutrient Cycling in Forage Systems'. Columbia, MO. (Eds RE Joost, CA Roberts).  
3 (Potash and Phosphate Institute and Foundation of Agronomic Research).  
4
- 5 Da Silva AP, Imhoff S, Corsi M (2003) Evaluation of soil compaction in an irrigated  
6 short-duration grazing system. *Soil & Tillage Research* **70**, 83-90.  
7
- 8 Da Silva AP, Kay BD, Perfect E (1997) Management versus inherent soil properties  
9 effects on bulk density and relative compaction. *Soil & Tillage Research* **44**, 81-93.  
10
- 11 Derner JD, Briske DD, Boutton TW (1997) Does grazing mediate soil carbon and  
12 nitrogen accumulation beneath C-4, perennial grasses along an environmental gradient?  
13 *Plant and Soil* **191**, 147-156.  
14
- 15 Dormaar JF, Smoliak S, Willms WD (1989) Vegetation and soil responses to short-  
16 duration grazing on fescue grasslands. *Journal of Range Management* **42**, 252-256.  
17
- 18 Dormaar JF, Smoliak S, WILLMS WD (1990) Distribution of nitrogen fractions in  
19 grazed and ungrazed fescue grassland Ah horizons *Journal of Range Management* **43**, 6 -  
20 9.  
21
- 22 Dormaar JF, Willms WD (1990a) Effect of grazing and cultivation on some chemical  
23 properties of soils in the mixed prairie. *Journal of Range Management* **43**, 456-460.  
24
- 25 Du Preez CC, Snyman WA (1993) Organic matter content of a soil in a semi-arid climate  
26 with three long-standing veld conditions. *African Journal of Range & Forage Science* **10**,  
27 108 - 110.  
28
- 29 Ewanek J (1995) Survey of nitrate-nitrogen in the soil profile under different field  
30 management practices in Manitoba. In 'The 39th Annual Manitoba Society of Soil  
31 Science Meeting'. Winnipeg, MB pp. 62 - 65. (University of Manitoba).  
32
- 33 Follett RF (2001) Organic carbon pools in grazing land soils. In 'The potential of U.S.  
34 grazing lands to sequester carbon and mitigate the greenhouse effect'. (Eds RF Follett, JM  
35 Kimble, R Lal) pp. 65–86 (Lewis Publishers: Boca Raton, Florida).  
36

- 1 Frank AB, Tanaka DL, Hofmann L, Follett RF (1995) Soil carbon and nitrogen of  
2 northern great plains grasslands as influenced by long term grazing. *Journal of Range*  
3 *Management* **48**, 470-474.  
4
- 5 Franzluebbbers AJ, Stuedemann JA (2003) Impact of cattle and forage management on  
6 soil surface properties in the southern Piedmont, USA. In 'Sod-Based Cropping Systems'.  
7 Quincy, Florida (Ed. FM Rhoads) pp. 71–80. (University of Florida).  
8
- 9 Gifford RM, Roderick ML (2003) Soil carbon stocks and bulk density: spatial or  
10 cumulative mass coordinates as a basis of expression? *Global Change Biology* **9**, 1507-  
11 1514.  
12
- 13 Gillen RL, Mccollum FT, Hodges ME, Brummer JE, Tate KW (1991) Plant community  
14 responses to short duration grazing in tallgrass prairie. *Journal of Range Management* **44**,  
15 124-128.  
16
- 17 Goodloe S (1969) Short duration grazing in Rhodesia. *Journal of Range Management* **22**,  
18 369-373.  
19
- 20 Gupta SC, Schneider EC, Larson WE, Hadas A (1987) Influence of corn residue on  
21 compression and compaction behavior of soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*  
22 **51**, 207-212.  
23
- 24 Hall TJ, Lee GR (1980) Response of *Astrelba* spp. grassland to heavy grazing by cattle  
25 and light grazing by sheep in north-west Queensland. *Australian Rangeland Journal* **2**, 83  
26 - 93.  
27
- 28 Haynes RJ, Williams PH (1993) Nutrient cycling and soil fertility in the grazed pasture  
29 ecosystem. *Advances in Agronomy* **49**, 119-199.  
30
- 31 Johnson J, Eckert D (1995) Best management practices: land application of animal  
32 manure. (The Ohio State University Extension) AGF **208**, 10pp.  
33  
34
- 35 Jones C (2000) Grazing management for healthy soils. In 'Stipa Inaugural National  
36 Grasslands Conference 'Better Pastures Naturally''. Mudges, NSW, Australia. (Ed. CM  
37 Waters) pp. 68-75.  
38

- 1 Kieft TL (1994) Grazing and plant canopy effects on semiarid soil microbial biomass and  
2 respiration. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* **18**, 155-162.  
3
- 4 Kim HT (1996) 'Soil sampling, Preparation and Analysis.' (Marcel Dekker: New York).  
5
- 6 Kumar K, Goh KM (2000) Crop residues and management practices: Effects on soil  
7 quality, soil nitrogen dynamics, crop yields, and nitrogen recovery. *Advances in*  
8 *Agronomy* **68**, 197-319.  
9
- 10 Lachat (1992) Determination of total kjeldahl nitrogen by flow injection analysis  
11 colorimetry. *QuikChem method 13-107-06-2-d. Lachat Instruments USA*  
12
- 13 Lachat (2001) Nitrate in 2M KCL soil extracts. *QuikChem method 12-107-04-1-B.*  
14 *Lachat Instruments USA*  
15
- 16 Lal R (2003) Global potential of soil carbon sequestration to mitigate the greenhouse  
17 effect. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences* **22**, 151-184.  
18
- 19 Liebig MA, Gross J, Kronberg SL, Hanson JD, Frank AB, Phillips RL (2006) Soil  
20 response to long-term grazing in the northern Great Plains of North America. *Agriculture*  
21 *Ecosystems & Environment* **115**, 270-276.  
22
- 23 Lull HW (1959) Soil compaction on forest and rangelands p. 21. (USDA Forest Service:  
24 Washington DC) Miscellaneous Pub. No. 768.  
25  
26
- 27 Maher JM (1996) 'Understanding and managing soils in the stanthorpe-rosenthal region.'  
28 (Department of natural resources: Brisbane).  
29
- 30 Manley JT, Schuman GE, Reeder JD, Hart RH (1995) Rangeland soil carbon and  
31 nitrogen responses to grazing. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* **50**, 294-298.  
32
- 33 Mathews BW, Sollenberger LE, Tritschler II JP (1996) Grazing systems and spatial  
34 distribution of nutrients in pastures - Soil considerations. In 'Nutrient Cycling in Forage  
35 Systems'. Columbia, Mo. (Eds RE Joost, CA Roberts) pp. 213-229.  
36
- 37 McCosker T (2000) Cell grazing - the first 10 years in Australia. *Tropical Grasslands* **34**,  
38 207-218.

- 1
- 2 Milchunas DG, Lauenroth WK (1993) Quantitative effects of grazing on vegetation and  
3 soils over a global range of environments. *Ecological Monographs* **63**, 327-366.  
4
- 5 Montani T, Busso CA, Fernandez OA, Brevedan RE (1996) Production and nitrogen  
6 cycling in an ecosystem of *Eragrostis Curvula* in semi-arid Argentina. 1. Plant biomass  
7 and productivity. *Acta Oecologia* **17**, 151-162.  
8
- 9 Mueller JP, Green JT (1995) Controlled grazing, Forage-Livestock Systems. West  
10 Virginia University Extension Service. Accessed at  
11 [www.caf.wvu.edu/~forage/controlgrazenc/fctrl.htm](http://www.caf.wvu.edu/~forage/controlgrazenc/fctrl.htm) on Nov 2007.  
12  
13
- 14 Murphy J, Riley JP (1962) A modified single solution method for the determination of  
15 phosphate in natural waters. *Analytica Chimica Acta* **27**, 31 - 36.  
16
- 17 Naeth MA, Bailey AW, Pluth DJ, Chanasyk DS, Hardin RT (1991) Grazing impacts on  
18 litter and soil organic matter in mixed prairie and fescue grassland ecosystems of Alberta.  
19 *Journal of Range Management* **44**, 7-12.  
20
- 21 Ohu JO, Raghavan GSV, McKyes E (1985) Peatmoss effect on the physical and  
22 hydraulic characteristics of compacted soils. *Transactions of the ASAE* **28**, 420-424.  
23
- 24 Olson SR, Cole CV, Watanabe FS, Dean LA (1954) Estimation of available phosphorous  
25 in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. (Ed. USDA). (US Department of  
26 Agriculture. Circular No 939.  
27
- 28 Paul EA, Clark FE (1996) 'Soil Microbiology and Biochemistry.' (Academic Press: San  
29 Diego CA).  
30
- 31 Rayment GE, Higginson FR (1992) 'Australian laboratory handbook of soil and water  
32 chemical methods.' (Inkata Press: Sydney).  
33
- 34 Rice EL (1984) 'Allelopathy.' (Academic Press: New York).  
35

- 1 Richards JH (1993) Physiology of plants recovering from defoliation. In 'XVII  
2 Internatinal Grasslands Congress'. Wellington, New Zealand. (Ed. MJ Baker) pp. 85 - 94.  
3 (SIR Publishing).  
4
- 5 Rodd AV, Papadopoulos YA, Laflamme LF, McRae KB, Fillmore SAE, Wilson RW  
6 (1999) Effect of rotational grazing on selected physical properties of a Gleyed Brunisolic  
7 Gray Luvisol loam in Nova Scotia. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science* **79**, 117-125.  
8
- 9 Ross MA (1977) Concurrent changes in plant weight and soil water regimes in  
10 herbaceous communities in Central Australia. *Australian Journal of Ecology* **2**, 257-268.  
11
- 12 Ruess RW, Menaughton SJ (1987) Grazing and the dynamics of nutrient and energy  
13 regulated microbial processes in the Serengeti grasslands. *Oikos* **49**, 101-110.  
14
- 15 Savory A, Parsons SD (1980) The Savory grazing method. *Rangelands* **2**, 234-237.  
16
- 17 Schuman GE, Reeder JD, Manley JT, Hart RH, Manley WA (1999) Impact of grazing  
18 management on the carbon and nitrogen balance of a mixed-grass rangeland. *Ecological*  
19 *Applications* **9**, 65-71.  
20
- 21 Sharpley A, Daniel TC, Sims JT, Pote DH (1996) Determining environmentally sound  
22 soil phosphorus levels. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* **51**, 160-166.  
23
- 24 Sims JR, Haby VA (1971) Simplified colorimetric determination of soil organic matter.  
25 *Soil Science* **112**, 137-141.  
26
- 27 Southorn NJ (2002) The soil structure component of soil quality under alternate grazing  
28 management strategies. *Advances in Geoecology* **35**, 163-170.  
29
- 30 Su YZ, Zhao HL, Zhang TH (2003) Influences of grazing and exclosure on carbon  
31 sequestration in degraded sandy grassland, Inner Mongolia, north China. *New Zealand*  
32 *Journal of Agricultural Research* **46**, 321-328.  
33
- 34 Theron JJ (1955) The recuperation of soils under grass pastures. In 'The grasses and  
35 pastures of South Africa Part 2 Pasture management in South Africa'. (Ed. D Meredith).  
36 (Central News Agency: Johannesburg).  
37



- 1 Tom N, Raman A, Hodgkins DS, Nicol H (2006) Populations of soil organisms under  
2 continuous set stocked and high intensity-short duration rotational grazing practices in  
3 the central tablelands of New South Wales (Australia). *New Zealand Journal of*  
4 *Agricultural Research* **49**, 261-272.  
5
- 6 Vallejo VR (1993) Evaluation of C:N ratio as a parameter of N mineralization. *Mitt. d.*  
7 *Oesterr. Bodenkundlichen Gesellschaft* **47**, 71-78.  
8
- 9 Vanhaveren BP (1983) Soil bulk-density as influenced by grazing intensity and soil type  
10 on a shortgrass prairie site. *Journal of Range Management* **36**, 586-588.  
11
- 12 Walkley A, Black TA (1934) An examination of the Degtjareff method for determining  
13 soil organic matter, and a proposed modification of the Chromic Acid Titration Method  
14 *Soil Science* **37**, 29-38.  
15
- 16 Wheeler MA, Trlica MJ, Frasier GW, Reeder JD (2002) Seasonal grazing affects soil  
17 physical properties of a montane riparian community. *Journal of Range Management* **55**,  
18 49-56.  
19
- 20 Whitehead DC (1995) Amounts, sources and fractionation of organic nitrogen in soils. In  
21 'Grassland nitrogen'. (Ed. DC Whitehead) pp. 82-107. (CAB International: Wallingford,  
22 Oxon, U.K).  
23
- 24 Wills AK (1979) 'The granite and traprock area of south east queensland. Part I – land  
25 inventory.' (Queensland department of primary industries: Brisbane).  
26  
27  
28  
29

1

2 **Figure legends:**

3

4 Figure. 1. Changes with time in TOC and TON of soils under different grazing treatments.

5 Error bars represent standard error (se)

6

7 Figure. 2. Changes in TOC and TON levels of soils in the sub-treatments of time-controlled and  
8 continuous grazing systems over the study period. Error bars represent standard error (se)

9

10 Figure. 3. Changes with time in C:N ratio of soils organic matter under different grazing  
11 treatments. Error bars represent standard error (se)

12

13 Figure 4 Changes in the available nitrogen and phosphorus of soils under different grazing  
14 systems during the study period. Error bars represent standard errors (se)

15

16 Figure. 5. Decline in nitrate and extractable P concentration as a result of the change in grazing  
17 management over time and distance from the sheep aggregation camp.

18

19 Figure. 6. Changes in herbage production in response to time-controlled and continuous grazing  
20 practices and the total rain prior to the sampling dates

21

22

23

24

25

Table. 1. A summary of soil characteristics in the study area

Grazing treatments	Soil depth cm	Slope %	Size fraction (%)			pH	EC mS
			sand	silt	clay		
TC grazing							
C1	40	10.2	34.6	28.7	36.7	5.9	0.07
C2	28	15.3	28.1	34.0	38.0	5.4	0.03
Continuous grazing							
C3	27	14.8	45.6	25.3	29.1	5.1	0.06
C4	42	10.0	31.6	31.0	37.4	5.9	0.08
Not grazed	35	13.0	37.1	30.0	32.9	5.6	0.04

Table. 2, Summary of stocking details for the two grazing treatments

Grazing Treatments	Grazing periods (days)	Rest periods (days)	Stocking rate (dse/ha)	Total stocking rate† dse.day/ha
TC grazing	14 ± 9‡	(101 ± 60)‡	12.6 ± 6 ‡	3608
Continuous grazing	365	0	1.6 ± 0.2	3529

‡- Means ± SD      †- Total dse days per hectare (DDH) using the original data of individual grazing operations over the whole study period of 2001 to 2006

Table. 3. Statistical analysis of ground litter accumulations in the grazing treatments over time

Grazing treatments	Values range kg/ha	Model equation†	R-Square	Correlation coefficient	<i>p</i> -value
C1	1618 ± 562	Y = 0.766X + 860	0.93	0.9639	0.0005***
C2	865 ± 239	Y = 0.293X + 567	0.75	0.865	0.012 **
C3	680 ± 99	Y = -0.025X + 705	0.03	-0.1762	0.7055 <i>ns</i>
C4	716 ± 187	Y = 0.196X + 522	0.55	0.742	0.0562*
No grazed	1702 ± 601	Y = 0.561X + 114	0.44	0.6596	0.107 <i>ns</i>

\*-  $p \leq 0.10$       \*\*-  $p \leq 0.05$       \*\*\*-  $p \leq 0.01$       ns – no significant different

† - X shows the number of days from May 2001 and Y represents the litter mass in kg/ha

Table. 4. Soil bulk density ( $\text{g}/\text{cm}^3$ ) responses to the grazing treatments over the study period and the correlation (Pearson) analysis between bulk density and time

Treatments	First year †	Last year †	Difference	Correl cf	<i>p</i> -value
Mean TC grazing	1.18 ± 0.02	1.19 ± 0.02	0.01 ns		
C1	1.20 ± 0.04	1.17 ± 0.02	-0.03 ns	-0.2201	0.4891
C2	1.16 ± 0.01	1.19 ± 0.05	0.02 ns	0.2852	0.4569
Mean Continuous grazing	1.22 ± 0.04	1.26 ± 0.03	0.04 ns		
C3	1.19 ± 0.03	1.28 ± 0.04	0.09 *	0.6051	0.0843*
C4	1.25 ± 0.08	1.25 ± 0.04	0.00 ns	-0.142	0.7155
Not grazed	1.15 ± 0.01	1.16 ± 0.01	0.01 ns	0.4119	0.2706

\*-  $p \leq 0.10$ ; ns – no significant different; † - Mean ± SD

Figure 1




Figure 2






Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6

