

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.

The effect of poplar stand density on hill country pastures

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

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Massey University, Palmerston North
New Zealand

**Andrew James Wall
2006**

Abstract

One-third of the North Island of New Zealand has been identified as requiring increased soil conservation if pastoral farming is to be sustainable. For over 50 years the planting of widely spaced poplar trees (*Populus* spp.) has been one of the main methods used to control soil erosion on hill pastures. Research has shown that these plantings have successfully decreased soil erosion but their impact on the productivity of pastoral farming has received little research attention. The research that has been undertaken has found poplars can suppress understorey pasture production by up to 40%, suggesting that farmers require more research information on the impact of planting conservation trees on the productivity of their farm if the use of conservation trees is to be more widely adopted on erosion prone land.

The objective of this thesis was to provide comprehensive data on the relationship between the range of poplar densities used for soil conservation on the light and soil under poplars, and consequently the effect on understorey pastures. Three field sites on commercial sheep and beef hill farms, in regions with contrasting summer soil moisture availability, Manawatu (one site) and Central Hawke's Bay (two sites), were monitored for two years. Tree stocking rates ranged from 0 to 375 trees/ha. Measurements were based on units of four trees with most measurements either directly below the tree crowns or in the gaps between the trees, but more intensive transect measurements were also made.

Photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) and the ratio of red to far red light (R:FR) were measured under the trees and in open pasture controls. Stand density indices used included all the commonly used measures of tree canopies, including digital photography, and stem diameter at breast height (DBH). PAR transmission was inversely related to all of the stand density indices with canopy closure based on digital photographs being the most robust of the indices used. PAR under the trees, relative to open pasture, was greater in the gaps than below tree crowns. Under a completely closed canopy, PAR transmission was reduced to 15-20% and 50-55% of the open pasture in summer and winter, respectively. The R:FR under the trees, relative to open pasture, decreased markedly at high stand densities (allowing less than 40% PAR transmission) in summer, but was similar in winter. The change in PAR under the trees was shown to be a major factor limiting pasture growth, particularly directly below the tree crowns. For both summer and winter, canopy closure

measured with a standard digital camera was strongly related to stand level PAR transmission ($r^2=0.88-0.97$; $P<0.0001$) and was also a practical method of measuring canopy closure in the field.

The soil measurements confirmed earlier research that soil pH increases under mature poplar trees. There was a 0.2 – 0.7 unit increase in soil pH in the upper 75 mm of soil over both contrasting regions. The soil fertility under the trees in terms of requirements for pasture growth was similar to that of the open pasture with calcium and potassium up to 2.2 and 9.0 quick test units higher in the soil under the trees than in the open pasture, respectively. The direct cause of the increased concentration of some cations under the trees was the annual tree leaf litter. Overall, the soil fertility under the trees had the potential to produce similar pasture production to that of the open pasture with the added advantage of less acid conditions.

Averaged over all sites the respective annual net herbage accumulation (ANHA) under poplar canopy closures of 25, 50 and 75 % was estimated from the equations developed to be 77, 60 and 48% of the open pasture. The greatest decrease was directly below the tree crowns where at canopy closures greater than 20% the ANHA was a relatively constant 50% of open pasture. In the vertically projected gap between trees the ANHA decreased by 6.6% relative to open pasture for each 10 % increase in canopy closure. At approximately 80% canopy closure there was no difference between the ANHA directly below the trees and in the gap. Pasture net herbage accumulation (NHA) under the trees relative to open pasture was at its lowest in summer and autumn (36% of open pasture under a closed canopy), and at its greatest in early spring before tree canopy leafed out (72% of open pasture under a closed canopy). The botanical composition and feed value of the pasture under the trees was broadly similar to that of the open pasture.

The greatest impact of the poplars on the pasture was decreased NHA due to shading. The decrease in NHA directly below mature unpruned poplars is substantial and would decrease farm profitability if the poplar stand density were high over a large area of the farm. The use of poplars for soil conservation is essential but these results show the importance of managing trees through pruning and thinning so that canopy closure is minimised. ANHA under the trees can be maintained at 75% of the open pasture if canopy closure is prevented from exceeding 30-40%.

Acknowledgements

My PhD could not have been completed without the assistance and guidance of so many people, but foremost my supervisors Associate Professor Peter Kemp and Dr Alec Mackay.

I thank Associate Professor Peter Kemp for his great patience, guidance, and encouragement during my studies and for the numerous readings and editing of my PhD manuscript. To Dr Alec Mackay I thank you for your guidance, enthusiasm for the project, and willingness to answer many questions, especially during when I was setting up the field experiments. Associate Professor Peter Kemp and Dr Alec Mackay were instrumental and the catalyst in the development of concepts and understanding of tree-pasture systems enabling this study.

Many thanks must go to all of the farmers involved in this project. Allister Clark and later Darrell Shellard (Kiwitea), John Dunderdale (Hautope), and Martin Meredith (Hautope) thank you for allowing me to use your properties for my fieldwork.

I would like to acknowledge the support of all those people who helped me in so many ways during the course of my PhD thesis. To Yvonne Gray and the ladies in the Herbage Laboratory at AgResearch Grasslands, I thank you for helping me with the pasture composition dissections. Thanks to Ian Power for travelling all the way down from Ruakura to take light measurements at each of the farm sites. Thanks to Aurelio Guevara-Escobar for teaching me how to analyse canopy digital images. Thanks also to Roger Levy for your tireless help with pasture cuts on some pretty rugged terrain and to Phil Budding for helping me with soil sampling and taking tree measurements. To all who helped me in the field, Naba Devkota, Tara Pande, Cameron McKinnon, Lee Matheson, Joanne Wall, Chris Wall, and many others, your assistance was greatly appreciated.

For financial support during my studies, I would like to express my gratitude to AgResearch. Their financial contribution and the scholarship opportunity they provided enabled this study to be undertaken.

My appreciation also goes out to my parents Suzanne and Chris Wall for their tremendous moral support and help over the years.

Finally I wish to thank Leesa Roy my partner, for her love, support, understanding, and extreme patience over the many years of my field research and during the writing up process of this thesis. I will never forget.

Contents

1	Introduction and objectives	1
2	The application of an experimental design to existing stands of poplar trees in New Zealand’s North Island hill country	10
3	The relationship between poplar stand density and PAR transmission	35
4	The effect of poplar overstorey density on soil chemical properties	126
5	The effect of poplar overstorey density on understorey pasture production	180
6	Conclusion	289
	Appendices	292

List of tables

Chapter 2

Table 2.1	General stand and trial site characteristics.	18
Table 2.2	Resource inventory for selecting experimental units at Kiwitea.	24
Table 2.3	Resource inventory for selecting experimental units at Hautope 1.	25
Table 2.4	Resource inventory for selecting experimental units at Hautope 2.	26
Table 2.5	Regression parameters for <i>P. x euramericana</i> stand basal area (m^2/ha) in relation to tree stocking rate (stems/ha), at each commercial farm site, where $Y = bX$ (constrained through origin).	27

Chapter 3

Table 3.1	Dates when canopy closure was measured in the field.	43
Table 3.2	Overstorey (stand) density indices.	48
Table 3.3	Regression equations, and their respective coefficients, developed for overstorey (stand) density indices to estimate the percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted at the centre of a vertically projected canopy gap (Zone 3) between fully in leaf <i>P. x euramericana</i> trees.	52
Table 3.4	Regression parameters (standard errors in parentheses) for equations predicting estimated PAR transmission (Zone 3%DIFN) from stand green crown length (m/h), where $Y=(a*b)/(b+x)$.	55
Table 3.5	Regression equations, and their respective coefficients, developed for overstorey (stand) density indices to estimate the percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted directly below (Zone1) the fully in leaf <i>P. x euramericana</i> crowns.	58
Table 3.6	Regression equations, and their respective coefficients, developed for overstorey (stand) density indices to estimate the percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap (Zone 3) between the leafless <i>P. x euramericana</i> trees.	62

Table 3.7	Regression parameters (standard errors in parentheses) for equations predicting estimated Zone 3 %DIFN individually from CCNL, BA, HPPCC and CEV, where $Y=a+b*x$.	64
Table 3.8	Regression parameters (standard errors in parentheses) for equations predicting estimated PAR transmission (Zone3 %DIFN) from stand green crown length (m/ha), where $Y=a+b*x$.	65
Table 3.9	Regression equations, and their respective coefficients, developed for overstorey (stand) density indices to estimate the percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted directly below (Zone 1) the leafless <i>P. x euramericana</i> crowns.	68
Table 3.10	Regression models, and their respective coefficients, developed for selected stand indices to predict canopy closure (CC).	71
Table 3.11	Relationships between the in-leaf canopy closure ratio (CCL) and estimated stand-level PAR transmission (weighted %DIFN).	73
Table 3.12	Regression parameters (standard errors in parentheses) for equations predicting understorey R:FR, relative to open pasture (%), from estimated PAR transmission (%DIFN), where $Y=a+b*\ln(x)$.	75
Table 3.13	Light transmission through various closed stands of deciduous trees.	91
Table 3.14	Maximum solar angle ^ψ above the horizon allowing direct-beam radiation to pass below the crown of an average sized tree to its base and also the shadow length produced by the same tree.	93

Chapter 4

Table 4.1	Kiwitea soil chemical properties: directly below the poplar crowns (Zone 1), at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between the trees (Zone 3), and within the open pasture.	135
Table 4.2	Hautope 1 soil chemical and biochemical properties: directly below the polar crowns (Zone 1), at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between the poplar trees (Zone 3), and within the open pasture.	141

Chapter 5

Table 5.1	Regression models and their respective coefficients, developed for CCL to predicted winter understorey NHA, relative to open pasture production.	201
Table 5.2	Pasture composition at Kiwitea, expressed as a percentage of total sward biomass (%DM).	216
Table 5.3	Main high fertility responsive (HFR) grasses and legumes at Kiwitea, expressed as a percentage of total sward biomass (%DM).	217
Table 5.4	Pasture composition at Hautope 1, expressed as a percentage of total sward biomass (%DM).	222
Table 5.5	Main high fertility responsive grasses and legume species at Hautope 1, expressed as a percentage of total sward biomass (%DM).	223
Table 5.6	Pasture composition at Hautope 2, expressed as a percentage of total sward biomass (%DM).	226
Table 5.7	Nutritive value indices for the mixed-species pasture at Kiwitea: directly below the crowns of individual trees (Zone 1), at the centre of the vertically projected gap between trees (Zone 3), and in the open pasture.	229
Table 5.8	Nutritive value indices for mixed-species pasture at Hautope 1: directly below the crowns of individual poplar trees (Zone 1), at the centre of the vertically projected gap between the poplar crowns (Zone 3), and in the open pasture.	235
Table 5.9	Nutritive value indices for <i>P. x euramericana</i> leaves at Kiwitea.	242
Table 5.10	Nutritive value indices for <i>P. x euramericana</i> leaves at Hautope 1.	243
Table 5.11	Major mineral elements ($\mu\text{g/g}$ DM) in the mixed-species pasture at Kiwitea: directly below the crowns of individual poplar trees (Zone 1), at the centre of the vertically projected gap between poplar crowns (Zone 3), and in the open pasture.	245

Table 5.12	Trace mineral elements ($\mu\text{g/g DM}$) in the mixed-species pasture at Kiwitea: directly below the crowns of individual poplar trees (Zone 1), at the centre of the vertically projected gap between poplar crowns (Zone 3), and in the open pasture.	246
Table 5.13	Major mineral elements ($\mu\text{g/g DM}$) in the mixed-species pasture at Hautope 1: directly below the crowns of individual poplar trees (Zone1), at the centre of the vertically projected gap between poplar crowns (Zone 3), and in the open pasture.	255
Table 5.14	Trace mineral elements ($\mu\text{g/g DM}$) in the mixed-species pasture at Hautope 1: directly below the crowns of individual poplar trees (Zone 1), at the centre of the vertically projected gap between poplar crowns (Zone 3), and in the open pasture.	256
Table 5.15	Major mineral elements ($\mu\text{g/g DM}$) in <i>Populus x euramericana</i> leaves at Kiwitea.	264
Table 5.16	Trace mineral elements ($\mu\text{g/g DM}$) in <i>P. x euramericana</i> leaves at Kiwitea.	264
Table 5.17	Major mineral elements ($\mu\text{g/g DM}$) in <i>Populus x euramericana</i> leaves at Hautope 1.	265
Table 5.18	Trace mineral elements ($\mu\text{g/g DM}$) in <i>P. x euramericana</i> leaves at Hautope 1.	265
Table 5.19	New Zealand studies measuring annual net herbage accumulation (ANHA) under poplars.	267

List of figures

Chapter 2

Figure 2.1	Schematic diagram of the pairing of tree and open pasture experimental units.	16
Figure 2.2	The relationship between stand basal area and tree stocking rate at Kiwitea (●), Hautope 1 (▲), and Hautope 2 (□).	27

Chapter 3

Figure 3.1	A schematic aerial view of four 'nuclei' trees (grey circles) defining the boundary (dashed lines) of an experimental unit.	41
Figure 3.2	Sample grid overlaid and centred on an experimental unit to estimate canopy closure (Knowles <i>et al.</i> 1999).	43
Figure 3.3	Overstorey environments within the boundary of an experimental unit: Zone 1 - area within the expanded canopy gap, directly underneath the crown of the 'nucleus' tree located at the north-eastern corner of an experimental unit; and Zone 3 - area at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap (also refer to Figure 3.1).	47
Figure 3.4	The estimated percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted at the centre of a vertically projected canopy gap (Zone 3) between fully in leaf poplars, over a range of (a) canopy closure ratios (CCL) measured with a standard digital camera and (b) stand basal areas (BA).	53
Figure 3.5	The estimated percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted at the centre of a vertically projected canopy gap (Zone 3) between fully in-leaf poplars, over a range of stand crown ellipsoidal volumes (CEV) at each farm site.	54
Figure 3.6	The estimated percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted at the centre of a vertically projected canopy gap (Zone 3) between fully in-leaf poplars, over a range of stand green crown lengths (GCL) at each farm site.	54

Figure 3.7	The estimated percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted directly below the fully in-leaf poplar crowns (Zone 1), over a range of (a) stand canopy closure ratios (CCL) measured with a standard digital camera and (b) stand basal areas (BA).	59
Figure 3.8	The estimated percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted at the centre of a vertically projected gap between leafless poplars (Zone 3), over a range of (a) canopy closure ratios (CCNL) measured with a standard digital camera and (b) stand basal areas (BA).	63
Figure 3.9	The estimated percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted at the centre of a vertically projected canopy gap (Zone 3) between leafless poplars, over a range of stand green crown lengths (m/ha).	65
Figure 3.10	The estimated percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted directly below (Zone 1) the leafless poplar crowns, over a range of (a) stand canopy closure ratios (CCL) measured with a standard digital camera and (b) stand basal areas (BA).	69
Figure 3.11	Mean estimated percentage of above-canopy PAR (%DIFN) transmitted directly underneath the individual poplar crowns (Zone 1) at each site.	70
Figure 3.12	Relationships between overstorey (stand) density indices.	72
Figure 3.13	Estimated stand-level PAR transmission (weighted %DIFN) across a range of in-leaf canopy closure ratios (CCL) in (a) summer and (b) winter.	74
Figure 3.14	The relationship between the understorey R:FR, relative to the open pasture, and estimated PAR transmission (%DIFN) through the poplar canopy in (a) summer (in-leaf) and (b) winter (no-leaf).	76
Figure 3.15	Schematic diagram illustrating the smaller angle of sky view seen from Zone 1 and its general skew away from the zenith compared to Zone 3.	82

Figure 3.16	Relationships between in-leaf canopy closure (CCL) and basal area (BA).	89
Figure 3.17	Comparison of relationships between no-leaf canopy closure (CCNL) and in-leaf canopy closure (CCL).	89
Figure 3.18	Comparison of the developed relationship between R_{FR} and estimated PAR transmission with data from other sources.	96
Figure 3.19	Estimated pasture dry matter production (\circ) at the centre of a vertically projected canopy gap (Zone 3) and (\blacktriangle) directly below the poplar crowns (Zone 1), over a range of stand canopy closure ratios in (a) summer and (b) winter.	100
Figure 3.20	Estimated tillering/branching (\circ) at the centre of a vertically projected canopy gap (Zone 3) and (\blacktriangle) directly below the poplar crowns (Zone 1), over a range of stand canopy closure ratios in (a) summer and (b) winter.	103
Figure 3.21	Estimated (a) dry matter production and (b) tillers/branches per plant for (\circ) perennial ryegrass/white clover and (\bullet) cocksfoot/lotus pastures at the centre of a vertically projected canopy gap (Zone 3) and for (Δ) perennial ryegrass/white clover and (\blacktriangle) cocksfoot/lotus pastures directly below the poplar crowns (Zone 1), over a range of stand canopy closure ratios (CCL) in summer.	107
Chapter 4		
Figure 4.1	Unbalanced nested factorial-treatment structure.	132
Figure 4.2	Kiwitea 0-75mm soil chemical properties linearly related to poplar canopy closure (CCL).	136
Figure 4.3	Kiwitea soil chemical properties linearly related to poplar canopy closure (CCL).	137
Figure 4.4	Hautope 1 0-75 mm soil chemical properties linearly related to poplar canopy closure (CCL).	142

Figure 4.5	Hautope 1 soil chemical properties linearly related to poplar canopy closure (CCL).	143
------------	---	-----

Chapter 5

Figure 5.1	Intensified sampling zones used for a limited number of experimental units at Kiwitea: Zones 1 & 5 – directly below the individual tree crowns on the northeast and southwest corners and experimental unit, respectively; Zone 3 – at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between the trees; and Zones 2 & 4 – transitional area midway between the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap and its respective northeast and southwest edge.	187
Figure 5.2	Annual net herbage accumulation (ANHA) over a range of in-leaf canopy closure ratios.	196
Figure 5.3	Annual net herbage accumulation (ANHA) stratified across the inter-tree space at Kiwitea (1998-2000).	197
Figure 5.4	Summer net herbage accumulation (NHA) over a range of in-leaf canopy closure ratios.	199
Figure 5.5	Autumn net herbage accumulation (NHA) over a range of in-leaf canopy closure ratios.	200
Figure 5.6	Winter net herbage accumulation (NHA) over a range of in-leaf canopy closure ratios.	202
Figure 5.7	Spring net herbage accumulation (NHA) over a range of in-leaf canopy closure ratios.	203
Figure 5.8	Net herbage accumulation (NHA), relative to the open pasture, across the inter-tree space at Kiwitea (1998-00) in: (a) summer, (b) autumn (c) winter, and (d) spring.	205
Figure 5.9	Residual herbage mass in each of the three main overstorey environments at (a) Kiwitea, (b) Hautope 1, and (c) Hautope 2.	208

Figure 5.10	Post-trimming Kiwitea residual herbage mass in (a) summer and (b) autumn over a range of poplar canopy closure ratios (CCL).	209
Figure 5.11	Post-trimming Hautope 1 & 2 residual herbage mass in (a) autumn and (b) winter over a range of poplar canopy closure ratios (CCL).	210
Figure 5.12	Residual herbage mass (RHM) stratified across the inter-tree space at Kiwitea in (a) late summer and (b) late autumn (1999-2000).	212
Figure 5.13	Relationship between spring pasture composition and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Kiwitea.	218
Figure 5.14	Relationship between the summer pasture composition and poplar canopy closure at Kiwitea.	219
Figure 5.15	Relationship between HFR grasses and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Hautope 1 in spring: (▲) directly below the poplar crowns (Zone 1), and (○) at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between the trees (Zone 3).	224
Figure 5.16	Relationship between dead pasture material and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Hautope 1 in summer: (▲) directly below the poplar crowns (Zone 1), and (○) at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between the trees (Zone 3).	224
Figure 5.17	Spring relationships between pasture nutritive (feed) value indices and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Kiwitea: (▲) directly below the crowns of individual trees (Zone 1), and (○) at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between trees (Zone 3).	231
Figure 5.18	Summer relationships between pasture nutritive (feed) value indices and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Kiwitea: (▲) directly below the crowns of individual trees (Zone 1), and (○) at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between trees (Zone 3).	232

Figure 5.19	Spring relationships between pasture feed value indices and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Hautope 1: (▲) directly below the crowns of individual trees (Zone 1) and (○) at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between trees (Zone 3).	237
Figure 5.20	Summer relationships between pasture feed value indices and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Hautope 1: (▲) directly underneath the crowns of individual trees (Zone 1), and (○) at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between trees (Zone 3).	238
Figure 5.21	Summer relationship between the dietary cation-anion difference (DCAD) and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Hautope 1: (▲) directly below the crowns of individual trees (Zone 1), and (○) at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between trees (Zone 3).	239
Figure 5.22	Spring relationships between major pasture minerals and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Kiwitea: (▲) directly below the crowns of individual trees (Zone 1), and (○) at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between trees (Zone 3).	248
Figure 5.23	Summer relationships between major pasture minerals and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Kiwitea: (▲) directly below the crowns of individual trees (Zone 1), and (○) at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between trees (Zone 3).	249
Figure 5.24	Spring relationships between pasture trace minerals and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Kiwitea: (▲) directly below the crowns of individual trees (Zone 1), and (○) at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between trees (Zone 3).	250
Figure 5.25	Summer relationship between strontium (Sr) and poplar canopy closure (CCL) at Kiwitea: (▲) directly below the crowns of individual trees (Zone 1), and (○) at the centre of the vertically projected canopy gap between trees (Zone 3).	251

List of appendices

Chapter 4

4.1	Experimental unit selections for soil samples taken at 75-150mm soil depth.	292
4.2	Annual Ca returned in the pasture and tree biomass at Kiwitea.	293
4.3	Mass-balance sulfur cycling model.	294

Chapter 5

5.1	Regression parameters (standard errors in parentheses) for equations predicting ANHA from in-leaf stand canopy closure (CCL).	295
5.2	Annual net herbage accumulation (ANHA) over a range of in-leaf canopy closures.	296