

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.

**DURATION-CONTROLLED GRAZING OF DAIRY COWS:  
IMPACTS ON PASTURE PRODUCTION  
AND LOSSES OF NUTRIENTS AND FAECAL MICROBES  
TO WATER**

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

**Doctor of Philosophy**  
**in**  
**Soil Science**

at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand



**Christine Lynne Christensen**

**2013**



## Abstract

Mitigation strategies for improved environmental sustainability of the New Zealand dairy industry need to focus on reducing the transport of nitrogen (N) from urine patches and phosphorus (P) and faecal microbes from dung patches to waterways. One strategy is Duration-controlled grazing (*DC* grazing), a system based upon shorter grazing periods on pasture (4 hours) and removing cows to a stand-off facility for rumination and excretion. The stored effluent is applied to pasture as a slurry at an appropriate time when nutrients are required and soil conditions are suitable.

A three year field study was established in the Manawatu to compare key features of *DC* grazing with a standard grazed (*SG*) system. This thesis explores the impact of a *DC* grazing system on the losses of N, P, potassium (K) and faecal microbes to water through drainage and surface runoff. It also investigates the effects of such a system on pasture production and intakes of pasture by cows.

Pasture accumulation was the same for both treatments in the first year, but there was a 20% and 9% decline on the *DC* treatment in the subsequent two years. This was due to the way that slurry applications were managed. A large amount of slurry (212 kg N/ha) was applied in the first year, and no slurry was applied in the second year. In the third year slurry was applied four times at a total rate of 115 kg N/ha. The study indicates more frequent application of all nutrients captured in the effluent from standing cows off is required to maintain pasture production.

Compared to the *SG* plots, the reductions in N losses from *DC* grazed plots were large, with an average 52% reduction in  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and 42% reduction in total N leached. Reducing urine deposition during autumn grazings appeared to have the largest impact on reducing  $\text{NO}_3^-$  leaching. Runoff losses of N were small and similar between treatments. The losses of P were small through both surface runoff and drainage. There was a large variation in runoff volume, which resulted in highly variable P runoff loads across plots and between treatments. The average 32% reduction in total P load from *DC* grazed plots was not significantly different from *SG* plots. Useful predictors of P load lost from all plots were runoff depth and the time cows spent grazing. Faecal microbe losses were also similar between treatments, with the useful predictors of faecal microbe concentration across all plots being the number of days since grazing and the climate after grazing.

The amount of K applied in slurry and urine had a large influence on both soil and herbage K. It was determined that in a *DC* grazing situation, the K-rich liquid component must be included in the applied slurry to maintain soil K levels.

The OVERSEER<sup>®</sup> nutrient budgeting software was able to simulate nutrient cycling in the *DC* grazing system reasonably well. The total N loss from the system was predicted accurately, although the relative proportion of N in drainage and runoff was not.

Several opportunities for further work arise from this research. While *DC* grazing is a tool that could be implemented to significantly reduce N leaching losses, the management of collected excreta needs to be further developed to ensure pasture production gains are realised, or at least maintained. The combined effects of reducing treading damage and *DC* grazing should be investigated. Finally, a comprehensive economic analysis of standing cows off should be undertaken.

## Acknowledgements

Completing a PhD thesis is the destination reached after a journey filled with discovery, emotional turmoil, the brightest of highs, and some very dark lows. Throughout the journey, I was extremely grateful to have several people by my side.

Firstly, to my supervisors. Professor Mike Hedley, my chief supervisor and the man who ignited my interest in nutrient cycling in soils, back when I was an undergraduate Ag student. I thank you for sharing your bottomless pit of knowledge, your critical analysis of my writing, and your passion for the wider FLRC group. Most of all, I thank you for your truly continuous inspiration – I am pursuing a career in Agricultural Science because of people like you.

Dr James Hanly, you have been a constant help. Your practical knowledge and assistance with field work, lab work, and writing has been much appreciated. I thank you for putting up with me constantly knocking at your door with ideas and ‘interesting facts’ about my research. I hope we will continue to enjoy a friendly working alliance as FLRC colleagues.

Associate Professor David Horne, your willingness to help me is valued. Your expertise and patience in anything to do with soil water has certainly helped me over the past few years, and your impeccable knowledge and use of the English language is enviable.

If it wasn't for the FLRC (Fertilizer & Lime Research Centre) technical team, then my large scale study could not have been completed. Bob Toes, your endless hours in the field have not gone unnoticed, thank you so much. Glenys Wallace, the time you have spent in the lab to help get thousands of samples analysed has been remarkable – thank you for your dedication, and also for your help with editing. Also Ross Wallace, Anja Moebis, Ian Furkert and Mike Bretherton, your assistance in the field and lab has been most appreciated, and Liza Haarhoff and Lance Currie, your help at an administrative and business management level is valued. I also appreciate the help I received from Zhao He and Mark Bebbington when carrying out statistical analysis. Thanks to the No 4 dairy farm staff for your cooperation in carrying out the research trial at the farm. Thank you to all the FLRC team and wider IAE (Institute of Agriculture & Environment) group for your continued friendship and camaraderie – long may it continue.

I am grateful to FLRC and IAE for funding my PhD studies, and also for allowing me the time to complete my studies. The trial was funded through the Pastoral 21 (Environment) programme (C10X0603), an important programme in providing real and usable answers for our agricultural industry into the future.

To Mum and Dad, Blair and Donna, Graham and Sue, and my extended family, thanks to you for instilling in me the values that were required to begin and complete this journey. You have always been very supportive of my decisions, which I appreciate. Also a special thanks to my loyal friends and colleagues who have provided support and advice over the duration of the journey - you know who you are.

Finally, but importantly, I would like to thank my husband James. You have been my rock of encouragement while completing this thesis and our partnership grows stronger every day. I thank you for your listening ear, your constructive comments, and your support in helping me to achieve my personal goals, while we continue to strive to reach our joint aspirations.

This destination has now been reached, but just around the corner are more journeys, to provide me with more challenge, fulfilment, and friendship, just like this one has.

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Figures.....</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>List of Plates .....</b>	<b>xix</b>
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Thesis Structure.....	3
1.2 References .....	5
<b>Chapter 2 A review of the literature .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	7
2.2 Nitrogen losses .....	7
2.3 Phosphorus losses.....	13
2.4 Faecal coliform losses .....	15
2.5 Potassium losses.....	16
2.6 Management options to reduce N, P, K and faecal microbe losses to waterways	17
2.6.1 Changes by farmers .....	17
2.6.2 Nitrification Inhibitors .....	17
2.6.3 Housing cows.....	18
2.6.4 Duration-controlled grazing.....	18
2.7 Summary .....	22
2.8 References .....	23
<b>Chapter 3 The Duration-controlled grazing system and its impact on pasture accumulation and cow intakes .....</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	29
3.2 Methods.....	31
3.2.1 Trial site .....	31



3.2.2	Experimental design.....	32
3.2.3	Estimated pasture dry matter accumulation, herbage quality and cow intakes . .....	34
3.2.4	Soil fertility and fertilisers .....	35
3.2.5	Soil water balance .....	36
3.2.6	Slurry application to Duration-controlled grazing plots to balance nutrient return .....	36
3.2.7	Effect of climate on cow intakes.....	39
3.2.8	Statistical analysis .....	39
3.3	Results .....	40
3.3.1	Climatic conditions .....	40
3.3.2	Pasture accumulation and grazing treatments .....	40
3.3.3	Treatment effect on estimated cow intakes .....	44
3.4	Discussion .....	46
3.4.1	Pasture accumulation - farm vs. plots .....	46
3.4.2	Pasture accumulation – annual differences .....	46
3.4.3	Pasture accumulation rates – Duration-controlled vs Standard grazed.....	47
3.4.4	Pasture intake by cows .....	49
3.5	Conclusion.....	52
3.6	References .....	53
<b>Chapter 4 The impact of Duration-controlled grazing on nitrogen losses in drainage water and surface runoff .....</b>		<b>59</b>
4.1	Introduction .....	59
4.2	Methods .....	60
4.2.1	Experimental design.....	60
4.2.2	Drainage and runoff measurements and water analysis .....	61
4.2.3	Soil water balance .....	62
4.2.4	Slurry application to Duration-controlled plots to balance nutrient return ....	62

4.2.5	Statistical analysis .....	63
4.3	Results .....	64
4.3.1	Climatic conditions and drainage volumes .....	64
4.3.2	Mineral nitrogen losses in drainage water .....	66
4.3.3	Total nitrogen losses in drainage water .....	68
4.3.4	Nitrogen losses in surface runoff .....	75
4.4	Discussion .....	76
4.4.1	Nitrogen losses in drainage water .....	76
4.4.2	Nitrogen losses in surface runoff .....	85
4.5	Conclusion.....	86
4.6	References .....	87
<b>Chapter 5 The impact of Duration-controlled grazing on phosphorus losses in surface runoff and drainage water .....</b>		<b>91</b>
5.1	Introduction .....	91
5.2	Methods.....	93
5.2.1	Trial site .....	93
5.2.2	Soil fertility and fertilisers .....	93
5.2.3	Slurry application.....	94
5.2.4	Rainfall, surface runoff and drainage water volume measurements, and water analysis .....	94
5.2.5	Statistical analysis .....	95
5.3	Results .....	96
5.3.1	Runoff volumes.....	96
5.3.2	Climatic factors influencing runoff and drainage .....	99
5.3.3	Runoff depth and phosphorus concentrations.....	101
5.3.4	Dissolved reactive phosphorus loads in runoff.....	101
5.3.5	Total phosphorus loads in runoff .....	106
5.3.6	Phosphorus losses in drainage water .....	108

5.4	Discussion .....	110
5.4.1	Phosphorus losses in runoff .....	110
5.4.2	Phosphorus losses in drainage water.....	113
5.5	Conclusion.....	114
5.6	References .....	116

## **Chapter 6 The impact of Duration-controlled grazing on faecal microbe concentrations in surface runoff and drainage water.....119**

6.1	Introduction .....	119
6.1	Methods .....	121
6.1.1	Trial site and trial management.....	121
6.1.2	Runoff and drainage water volume measurements and water analyses.....	121
6.1.3	Statistical analysis .....	122
6.2	Results and Discussion.....	122
6.2.1	<i>E. coli</i> in runoff water .....	122
6.2.2	<i>E. coli</i> in drainage water .....	130
6.2.3	<i>E. coli</i> in slurry applied to land .....	131
6.3	Conclusion.....	131
6.4	References .....	133

## **Chapter 7 Potassium cycling and the practice of standing cows off: risks and opportunities.....135**

7.1	Abstract .....	135
7.2	Introduction .....	136
7.3	Methods .....	137
7.3.1	Trial site .....	137
7.3.2	Experimental design.....	137
7.3.3	Estimated pasture dry matter accumulation, herbage elemental analysis and dung deposition.....	138
7.3.4	Drainage water volume measurements and water analysis.....	138

7.3.5	Statistical analysis .....	139
7.4	Results and Discussion.....	139
7.5	References .....	143
<b>Chapter 8</b>	<b>Nitrogen loss mitigation using duration-controlled grazing: Field observations compared to modelled outputs .....</b>	<b>145</b>
8.1	Abstract .....	145
	Keywords: .....	145
8.2	Introduction .....	146
8.3	Methods.....	147
8.3.1	Trial site .....	147
8.3.2	Experimental design .....	147
8.3.3	Estimated dung deposition and slurry application .....	147
8.3.4	Drainage water volume measurements and water analysis .....	148
8.3.5	Comparison of measured vs. modelled losses .....	148
8.4	Results and Discussion.....	150
8.5	Conclusion.....	153
8.6	References .....	153
<b>Chapter 9</b>	<b>Summary and opportunities for future work.....</b>	<b>155</b>
9.1	Summary and justification of this study.....	155
9.2	Main findings from this research .....	155
9.2.1	Pasture accumulation and cow intakes (Chapter 3) .....	155
9.2.2	Nitrogen losses (Chapter 4) .....	156
9.2.3	Phosphorus losses (Chapter 5) .....	157
9.2.4	Faecal coliform losses (Chapter 6) .....	157
9.2.5	Potassium losses (Chapter 7) .....	158
9.2.6	Validation of Duration-controlled grazing within Overseer <sup>®</sup> (Chapter 8) ..	158
9.3	Limitations of this research .....	158
9.4	Opportunities for future research .....	160



## List of Figures

Figure 1.1	Overall aim of experiment and specific hypotheses and objectives for each component of the study.	4
Figure 2.1	Nitrogen (N) transfers in a dairy cow grazing system, for one day's grazing, assuming 100 cows/ha ingesting 1200 kg DM pasture @ 2.5% N and 350 kg DM maize silage @ 1% N.	8
Figure 2.2	Mean $\text{NO}_3^-$ concentration in drainage, with arrows indicating urea application and grazing (dashed line = Area A, solid line = Area B) (Sharpley, 1977).	12
Figure 2.3	Phosphorus (P) cycle in a dairy cow grazing system, for one day's grazing, assuming 100 cows/ha ingesting 1200 kg DM pasture @ 0.33% P and 350 kg DM maize silage @ 0.15% P.	14
Figure 2.4	Nitrogen (N) transfers in a dairy cow grazing system, for one day's grazing with cows being housed indoors for 12 hours of the day (grazed on pasture for 8 hours per day), assuming 100 cows/ha ingesting 1200 kg DM pasture and 350 kg DM maize silage.	20
Figure 3.1	Schematic diagram showing measurements taken for each parameter of pasture accumulation and estimated pasture intakes by cows.	34
Figure 3.2	Daily rainfall (mm) and soil water deficit (mm) at No. 4 Dairy Farm from September 2008 to September 2011.	41
Figure 3.3	Estimated pasture accumulation for each study year, from September 2008 to September 2011. Error bars represent standard error for the total accumulation period.	42
Figure 3.4	Daily average pasture growth rates (kg DM/ha/day) for each study year, from September 2008 to September 2011, for rotationally grazed plots on the two treatments ( <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> ).	43
Figure 3.5	Allocated pasture per cow per grazing (accumulated cover – lowest post-grazing cover measured of 1496 kg DM/ha) plotted against the actual pasture intakes per cow per grazing for all grazings in all years. Regression line encompasses every grazing from both treatments.	50
Figure 3.6	Average Heat Load Index for the duration of each grazing plotted against actual intakes per cow (kg DM), for every grazing in all years. Regression line encompasses every grazing from both treatments.	51

Figure 4.1	Mean drainage (mm) measured for all <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> plots, and rainfall and modelled soil water deficit for each event from 2009-2011. Soil water deficit and drainage depth are absolute values, but are displayed as negative values to add clarity to the figure.	65
Figure 4.2	Concentration of $\text{NO}_3^-$ (ppm) in drainage water from 2009-2011, and the cumulative depth of drainage (mm) for <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> grazing treatments. (Error bars represent standard error at each sampling event; see legend for pasture management activities).	67
Figure 4.3	Concentration of TN (ppm) in pipe drainage water from 2009-2011, and the cumulative depth of drainage (mm) for <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> grazing treatments. Error bars represent standard error at each sampling event.	69
Figure 4.4	Cumulative $\text{NO}_3^-$ -N and TN leached (kg/ha) in drainage water from 2009-2011, for <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> grazing treatments.	71
Figure 4.5	Total organic nitrogen (TON) and measured $\text{NO}_3^-$ -N leached from <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatments, from 2009-2011. The sum of $\text{NO}_3^-$ -N and TON is assumed to be total N (TN) leached due to measured $\text{NH}_4^+$ leaching being negligible.	73
Figure 4.6	TON leached (g/mm drainage/ha) with cumulative drainage (mm) from <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatments in 2009-2011.	74
Figure 4.7	Estimated urinary nitrogen not taken up by pasture (Eq. 4.7) from autumn grazings and N leached ( $\text{NO}_3^-$ and TN) for the subsequent drainage season, for <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatment plots in 2009-2011.	83
Figure 4.8	Estimated urinary nitrogen not taken up by pasture (kg/ha) for <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatments after seasonal grazings from 2009-2011. (Autumn grazings = March-May; summer grazings = December-February; spring grazings = September-November).	84
Figure 5.1	The relationship between measured runoff at each event and rainfall (mm) for each of 14 plots. The ruled line represents a 1:1 relationship, where rainfall equals runoff depth.	97
Figure 5.2	The relationship between measured runoff at each event and rainfall for each plot after outliers had been removed. The ruled line represents a 1:1 relationship, where rainfall equals runoff depth.	98
Figure 5.3	Measured rainfall, modelled soil water deficit, and average runoff depth (mm) at each event from <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatments, from April to December in 2009-2011. Soil water deficit and drainage depth are absolute values, but have been shown as negative values to add clarity to the figure.	100

Figure 5.4	Average depth (mm) of runoff at each event for <i>SG</i> and <i>DC</i> treatments in 2009-2011.	102
Figure 5.5	Average concentration of dissolved reactive phosphorus (ppm) for <i>SG</i> and <i>DC</i> treatments at each runoff event in 2009-2011.	103
Figure 5.6	Dissolved reactive phosphorus load (kg P/ha) in runoff compared with depth of runoff at each event for <i>SG</i> and <i>DC</i> treatments from 2009-2011.	105
Figure 5.7	Total phosphorus load (kg/ha) in runoff compared with the depth of runoff for each event for <i>SG</i> and <i>DC</i> treatments, from 2009-2011.	107
Figure 5.8	Cumulative dissolved reactive phosphorus and total phosphorus load (kg P/ha) in drainage for <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> grazing treatments, from 2009-2011.	109
Figure 6.1	Measured rainfall, modelled soil water deficit, and average surface runoff depth (mm) at each event from all grazed plots on <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatments, from April-December, 2009-2011.	123
Figure 6.2	Average <i>E. coli</i> counts in runoff (most probable number/100mL) occurring at different times after grazing events from <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatment plots, from 2009-2011.	127
Figure 6.3	Average <i>E. coli</i> counts (most probable number/100mL) compared with runoff depth for each runoff event from <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatment plots from 2009-2011.	129
Figure 7.1	Herbage potassium concentrations at each grazing for <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> grazing treatments.	140
Figure 7.2	Cumulative potassium leached in drainage water for <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatments, from 2009-2011.	141





## List of Tables

Table 3.1	Approximate schedule of daily activity for standard ( <i>SG</i> ) and duration-controlled ( <i>DC</i> ) grazing treatments.	32
Table 3.2	Soil test results for the trial site in 2008, 2010 and 2012, averaged for both treatments (Duration-controlled grazing ( <i>DC</i> ) and standard grazing ( <i>SG</i> )).	35
Table 3.3	Fertiliser applications to all plots at the trial site from September 2008 to September 2011.	36
Table 3.4	Amount of nitrogen (N) returned (kg/ha) to <i>DC</i> plots in slurry applications, the estimated annual return of N in dung and urine to <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatments using dung counts, and the reduction in N returned to <i>DC</i> plots.	37
Table 3.5	Average stocking intensity (cows/ha) and dung pat deposition (per ha and per cow/hour) for <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> grazing treatments in 2008/09; '24hr' denotes 8hr grazing for <i>DC</i> , 24hr grazing for <i>SG</i> .	44
Table 3.6	Average cow pasture intakes (kg DM/cow) for each grazing period in each season, and range of intakes for each season; '24hr' denotes 8hr grazings for <i>DC</i> , 24hr grazings for <i>SG</i> .	45
Table 4.1	The estimated annual return of nitrogen (N) in dung and urine to <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatments, the theoretical target slurry application, and the actual return of N in slurry (kg N/ha/yr).	63
Table 4.2	Total amount of $\text{NO}_3^-$ -N and TN leached in drainage water from 2009-2011, for <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> grazing treatments, and proportion of N in the first 100 mm of drainage, 100-200 mm drainage, and >200 mm drainage for each year.	72
Table 4.3	Total amounts of $\text{NO}_3^-$ -N, $\text{NH}_4^+$ -N, and TN lost in surface runoff water from 2009-2011 for <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> grazing treatments.	75
Table 5.1	Soil test results (pH and Olsen P) for the trial site.	93
Table 5.2	Quantity of phosphorus returned (kg/ha) to <i>DC</i> plots in slurry applications.	94
Table 5.3	Amounts (kg P/ha/yr) of DRP and TP lost in runoff, and average depth of runoff, from <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatments for 2009-2011 (TP value in italics includes outlier identified in 2011; values in parentheses show standard error of the mean for each cumulative load).	104

Table 5.4	Amounts (kg P/ha) of DRP and TP lost in drainage, and average drainage depth, from <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatments for 2009-2011 (values in parentheses show standard error of the mean for each cumulative load).	108
Table 6.1	<i>E. coli</i> counts (MPN/100mL) in drainage from <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatment plots in 2009 and 2010.	130
Table 8.1	Parameters entered into Overseer (based on Massey No 4 Dairy Farm) for both <i>SG</i> and <i>MDC</i> treatment systems.	149
Table 8.2	The estimated annual return of nitrogen in dung and urine to <i>DC</i> and <i>SG</i> treatments, the theoretical target slurry application, the difference in N returned to <i>DC</i> plots, the actual return of N in slurry, and Overseer predictions (kg N/ha/yr).	151

## List of Plates

Plate 3.1	Layout of the fourteen ca. 850 m <sup>2</sup> , experimental plots (those marked with 'DC' denote Duration-controlled grazing plots, with the remainder being standard grazed plots; dots denote corners of 50 m <sup>2</sup> runoff plots).	33
Plate 3.2	Applying slurry to Duration-controlled grazing plots, using a Williams 'Elephant 5000' slurry tanker, October 2010.	38
Plate 4.1	Individual tipping buckets and collection area for drainage and runoff water.	61
Plate 4.2	Technicon Auto Analyser used for colorimetric NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> and TN analysis in the laboratory.	62
Plate 6.1	Example of a runoff plot photographed to observe spatial distribution of dung pats; runoff catching gutter is bottom centre, isolated by white electric fence standards.	121