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RESPONSE OF COMMON BUFFELGRASS TO PASTURE RENOVATION PRACTICES
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Summary

This paper presents information on the responses observed in common buffelgrass (Cenchrus ciliaris) biomass production using several different pasture renovation practices. These evaluations were conducted at nine South Texas locations during 1987-1993. In late winter, treated plots were renovated using commercially available aerators, chisels, rootplows, and paratill plow. Biomass on treated and adjacent non-treated areas was harvested quarterly to determine forage production. Greater buffelgrass production was observed for all renovation treatments, at all locations, and for all years relative to non-treated plots. During periods of drought, total forage production declined in the non-treated check plots; but where soil renovation practices were employed, greater buffelgrass production was sustained. Renovation was most effective in rejuvenating sparse, deteriorating buffelgrass stands.

Introduction

Common buffelgrass was introduced into South Texas from South Africa in the late 1940's and presently occupies 1.6 million acres of rangeland and pastures in the region. Buffelgrass can increase grass productivity five-fold over native brushland in South Texas (Hanselka, unpubl. data). Gonzales (1993) reported that buffelgrass has allowed Webb county livestock producers to increase their livestock stocking rates from 36 ac/a.u. on native rangeland to 25.5 ac/a.u. However, despite the advantages of high productivity and resistance to drought and overuse, buffelgrass needs to be carefully managed or stands will decline in productivity.

While overgrazing and drought are obvious causes of production decline, soil compaction by equipment traffic and livestock trampling is less obvious (Hanselka, Livingston, and Bade 1993). Buffelgrass will become "root-bound" in tightly packed soils. This, in combination with roots weakened by overgrazing, will inhibit root growth and distribution and effective use of rainfall (Fryrear and McGully 1972). A variety of practices have been used to alleviate soil compaction on ranges and pastures. Perennial grasses produced significantly more biomass after
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pitting or ripping treatments in Wyoming (Rauzi, 1973). Another Wyoming study compared plowing, rotovating, and blading to renovate rangeland (Rauzi, 1975, 1980) with each of the soil treatments resulting in increased herbage yields. Ripping and furrowing shortgrass rangeland led to the greatest increase in production during the first year after renovation and significant increases during subsequent high rainfall years (Griffith, et. al., 1984). It was estimated that increased carrying capacity would result in a full return for renovation costs in four years.

Despite declines in buffelgrass productivity attributed to soil compaction there have been few investigations into buffelgrass responses to range or pasture renovation practices. Parra, et al (1984) reported significant increases in buffelgrass production on subsoiled plots over non-treated plots in Sonora, Mexico. Subsoiled areas also out-produced roller chopping and burning treatments in that study. This paper reports the results of a series of studies on common buffelgrass biomass production responses to several pasture renovation practices.

**Procedure**

A series of three studies were conducted on the Rio Grande Plains of Texas from 1987 through 1993. The first study was located near Encinal (Webb county), Hebbronville and Benavides (Duval county), Bustamante (Zapata county), and El Sauz (Starr county) in South Texas. Five deteriorated common buffelgrass pastures were chiseled (ripped) in January and February, 1987. The ripping was accomplished by pulling a 3-shank chisel through each pasture. The shanks were set on a three foot spacing and ripped the clay loam soils to a depth of 15-20 inches. This treatment effectively broke surface crusts and hardpans as well as fractured the soil between the ripped furrows.

The second study measured buffelgrass responses to subsoiling with a finless root plow (essentially a moldboard plow) and a paratill plow. These treatments were located on two ranches near Mirando City and Zapata (Jim Hogg and Zapata counties, respectively) from 1988 through 1991. Each treatment effectively subsoiled to a depth of 18 to 24 inches.

The third study was located near Hebbronville in Jim Hogg county from 1992 through 1993. Applications consisted of treating the deteriorated, brush infested pasture with a "pasture aerator." The blades of this tool cut 9 in. long x 3 in. wide furrows in the soil eight in. in depth while chopping brush regrowth into small pieces.

Biomass responses were measured in all experiments by placing 10 wire grazing exclosures (1 m² area) on each treated area and 10 exclosures on an adjacent non-treated area. The grasses within the exclosure were harvested quarterly to a cutting height of 4 in. The
exclosures were moved after each harvest to a newly clipped adjacent area to negate the effects of frequent defoliations. Harvested samples were dried, weighed and biomass production calculated as pounds of dry matter per acre. The four harvests from each location were added to obtain total annual production.

Results and Discussion

The use of a chisel to rip and fracture compacted soil resulted in an average increase of 1683 lbs of dry forage per acre across five locations during the treatment’s first year (Table 1). Positive responses were also apparent the second year (+1358 lb/acre) but decreased dramatically by the third year. The South Texas region had experienced a deepening drought from the fall of 1987 through 1989 and reduced buffelgrass biomass production reflects the lack of rainfall in 1989 on the study areas. Production was very low on all plots during 1989, but grasses on the treated areas consistently out-produced those from the non-treated areas. A positive production response to the treatments occurred at all locations over the three year period.

The production increases of 23% - 119% in 1987, 56% - 126% in 1988, and 19% - 423% in 1989 reflect several trends. Ripping to a depth of 20 inches allowed more water into the soil which buffelgrass plants efficiently utilized, resulting in increased biomass production. In general, the treated areas that received the most rainfall, in any year, responded with the greatest biomass increases over the non-treated plots.

Sparse grass stands on compacted soils received the most benefit from subsoiling. Such stands (e.g. Encinal and Hebbronville) responded quickly and positively to treatment. An increase in volunteer reseeding occurred and by the second year the treated stand produced as much or more forage than it did the first year. An increase in stand density and basal cover was noted subsequent to chiseling. This corresponds to results reported by Parra et al. (1984). Strong, healthy stands (e.g. El Sauz) exhibited a weak response to chiseling.

The paratill, rootplow, and 3-shank chisel were also used to evaluate buffelgrass responses to renovation practices from 1988 to 1991. The paratill plow is a subsoiler that shatters soil compaction using lift/fall principles. The same is true for the rootplow minus the lifting fins as this plow is pulled through the soil causing the top layer of soil to be lifted and then it settles with minimal disturbance. Each treatment allows improved water percolation into the soil.

Improved growing conditions are reflected in biomass production responses of buffelgrass to paratill plow, root plow and chisel treatments (Table 2). Positive responses occurred on all treatments and advantages were recorded for each of the four post-treatment years. These trials
were initiated during the first year of the multi-year drought and decreased production on the
control plots (especially at the Zapata site) reflects the drought impact. The dry period lasted
through 1989 and into 1990 when the non-treated areas responded to increased rainfall. The non-
treated Zapata site exhibited the smallest difference between treated and non-treated plots over
the life of the experiment. Production greatly improved after renovation at the Mirando City
location, resulting in a doubling of forage production at that site.

The "pasture aerator" is a modified roller chopper with a series of small blades attached
in spiralling rows on a revolving, heavy drum. Each row is 1 ft. apart and the blades are
arranged in a staggered fashion in relation to each other. The result is that each blade cuts a
narrow furrow 6 to 8 inches deep and fractures the soil as it is pulled out of the ground. The
blades also cut and chop brush into small pieces. This tool was used to renovate two pastures
near Hebbronville in 1992 resulting in a 245% increase in production between treated and non-
treated areas the first year (Table 3). Response was lower the second year (126%), but the
decrease may be attributed to fall drought in the area. More than 1200 lb/acre of additional
forage was produced on the renovated plots.

It appears that subsoiling or other range and pasture renovation practices benefit
buffelgrass yields. Buffelgrass responded positively to all the tools used in this investigation.
Response is immediate and may last 5 years or more but the amount of response depends upon
the density and health of the initial stand and subsequent rainfall. Increased biomass production
was a function of improved health and vigor of the plants and increased numbers of plants.
Approximate costs of the use of the three types of equipment are $25.00/acre.

The decision to renovate buffelgrass pastures and which tool to use will depend on stand
density, health and vigor of the grass plants, and soil type. Branson et al. (1966) found that
medium to fine textured soils are the most suitable for mechanical treatments. Common
buffelgrass generally grows on clay loam soils that are subject to compaction and will benefit
from soil renovation. The choice of equipment will also depend upon availability and energy
requirements to pull the tools. Costs/benefits should be carefully analyzed in the decision-making
process. Finally, renovating buffelgrass pastures must be carefully planned and integrated into
the total ranch management system.
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Table 1. Production of forage (lbs/acre air dried) from chiseled and non-chiseled buffelgrass pastures, at five locations in South Texas, 1987-1989.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encinal</td>
<td>+1803</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+391</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+305</td>
<td>423%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebbronville</td>
<td>+3170</td>
<td>119%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+1188</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+58</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Sauz</td>
<td>+665</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+1933</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+170</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustamante</td>
<td>+1521</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+1420</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+577</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benavides</td>
<td>+1257</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+1856</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+175</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>+1683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Comparative responses of common buffelgrass (lbs/ac) to subsoiling with the paratil, rootplow, and chisel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rootplow</th>
<th>Paratil</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mirando City</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>4629</td>
<td>3357</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5946</td>
<td>5028</td>
<td>2840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3579</td>
<td>3008</td>
<td>1545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3661</td>
<td>3183</td>
<td>2573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapata</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>4394</td>
<td>4150</td>
<td>3470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7137</td>
<td>5992</td>
<td>5336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3661</td>
<td>3183</td>
<td>2573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Buffelgrass responses to treatments by the "Pasture Aerator", Hebbronville, Texas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Treated</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent Change %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>5435</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>3844</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>