

**Levelling the Playing Field: Exploring Methods of
Reducing Weed Competition to Improve the
Establishment of Native Ground Cover on Former
Agricultural Land**

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy (Faculty of Science)

May 2015

Emanuelle Gerlach

B. Env. Sc. (Hons)

School of Biological Sciences
Discipline of Ecology and Environmental Science
The University of Adelaide

Table of Contents

List of Tables	i
List of Figures	iii
Declaration	vii
Abstract	viii
Acknowledgements	x
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
HABITAT RESTORATION.....	1
Revegetation	2
Ground Cover	3
GREY BOX GRASSY WOODLANDS	4
Limitations to Ground Cover Establishment	6
GLENTHORNE FARM.....	10
Methods and Strategies for Improving Ground Cover Establishment	12
SUMMARY	18
Chapter 2: The effects of light and nutrient limitation on invasive annual grasses – implications for weed control for native revegetation.	20
INTRODUCTION	20
METHODS	23
Analysis.....	24
RESULTS.....	25
Carbon Addition	25
Subsoil	25
Shade	28
Comparison Between Treatments.....	28
DISCUSSION	28
Carbon Addition	28
Topsoil Removal	30
Shade	31
CONCLUSION	32
Chapter 3: Testing methods of weed inhibition in the field to improve groundcover revegetation success.	34
INTRODUCTION	34
METHODS	38

Site Description	38
Experimental Design	39
Soil Testing	42
Analysis	43
RESULTS	43
Soil.....	43
Weeds	44
Natives	49
DISCUSSION.....	55
Carbon Addition	55
Scalping	57
Shade.....	59
Canopy	60
CONCLUSION.....	61
Chapter 4: Can topsoil removal increase the establishment of native herbaceous species on retired agricultural land?.....	64
INTRODUCTION.....	64
METHODS.....	66
Site Description	66
Experimental Design	67
Analysis	69
RESULTS	69
Weed Species.....	69
Weed Cover.....	73
Natives	75
DISCUSSION.....	84
Effects of Treatments on Weeds.....	84
Effects of Treatments on Native Species	86
CONCLUSION.....	88
Chapter 5: Summary and recommendations for groundcover revegetation	90
SUMMARY OF TREATMENT RESULTS.....	90
Carbon Addition	90
Topsoil Removal.....	92
Tree Canopies	95

Planting Density.....	96
Study Limitations.....	99
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	99
CONCLUSION.....	101
Appendix 1.....	103
Appendix 2.....	105
References.....	107

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: The numbers of replicates of each plant species in each treatment that were successfully planted and harvested after 11 weeks growth in the glasshouse.	24
Table 2.2: One-Way ANOVA of treatment effects on different growth parameters for four invasive annual grass species grown in a glasshouse for 11 weeks. Treatments were topsoil (control), carbon addition, shade and topsoil removal (subsoil).	26
Table 3.1: A list of the native Australian grassland species used for this study and the number of seeds planted per 0.75 m x 0.75 m plot in low density and high density seed treatments.	42
Table 3.2: Soil nutrient analysis of Glenthorne Farm soils taken from treatment blocks 16 months after initial treatment application. Treatments were; 3 monthly applications of sugar and sawdust (+Carbon), removal of 5 cm of topsoil (Scalp), location under tree canopies (Canopy) and a Control. Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric tests were used to determine differences. Different letters within each row show significant differences between treatments ($P < 0.05$). Values are medians, $n = 8$	44
Table 3.3: Local native species planted at Glenthorne Farm in May 2011. Seeds were planted in 75 cm x 75 cm plots, each allocated one of five treatments; 3 monthly applications of sugar and sawdust (Carbon), removal of 5 cm of topsoil (Scalp), covering with shade cloth (Shade), location under tree canopies (Canopy) and a Control. The table lists the total number of plants in all the plots for each treatment, the maximum percentage cover of each species in a single plot and the proportion of plots in which each species was present in October 2011 and October 2012.	50
Table 4.1: The amount of seed of each species planted per 1 m x 1 m plot at Glenthorne Farm. F plots contained grasses and forbs, G plots contained grasses only, and EU plots contained only <i>Eucalyptus microcarpa</i> seed.	68
Table 4.2: Results of one-way ANOVA comparing the percentage cover and the number of individuals of native grasses grown from seed in 1 m x 1 m experimental plots on Glenthorne Farm, South Australia. Existing vegetation was removed from the plots in May 2012 using four different methods; manual removal with a mattock (Control), glyphosate application (Herbicide), topsoil removal using a grader (Scalp) and topsoil removal followed by glyphosate application 3 weeks later (Scalp + Herbicide). Seeds of 4 <i>Rytidosperma</i> species (400 seeds) and <i>Microlaena stipoides</i> (50 seeds) were planted in June 2012 and data collected monthly from August to November 2012. Values are means \pm standard error, different letters on each row indicate significant differences between treatments using Tukey post-hoc tests ($P < 0.05$).	80
Table 4.3: Results of Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric tests comparing the percentage cover and the number of individuals of three native forbs grown from seed in 1 m x 1 m experimental plots on Glenthorne Farm, South Australia. Existing vegetation was removed from the plots in May 2012 using four different methods; manual removal with a mattock (Control), glyphosate application (Herbicide), topsoil removal using a grader (Scalp) and topsoil removal followed by glyphosate application 3 weeks later (Scalp + Herbicide). Seeds of <i>Vittadinia gracilis</i> (50 seeds), <i>Arthropodium strictum</i> (50 seeds) and <i>Calostemma purpureum</i> (23 bulbs) were planted in June 2012 and data collected monthly from August to November 2012. Values are medians with interquartile range in brackets, different letters on each row indicate significant differences between treatments using Dunn's pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment ($P < 0.05$).	81
Table 4.4: Results of Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric tests comparing the percentage of plants flowering and the number of inflorescences per flowering plant of three native species grown	

from seed in 1 m x 1 m experimental plots on Glenthorne Farm, South Australia. Existing vegetation was removed from the plots in May 2012 using four different methods; manual removal with a mattock (Control), glyphosate application (Herbicide), topsoil removal using a grader (Scalp) and topsoil removal followed by glyphosate application 3 weeks later (Scalp + Herbicide). Seeds were sown in June 2012 and the numbers of inflorescences per plant were counted in November 2012. Values are medians with interquartile range in brackets. Different letters on each row indicate significant differences between treatments using Dunn's pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment ($P < 0.05$)..... 83

Table 5.1: A list of the Australian native species planted in trays in the nursery to create seedling islands. 97

Table 5.2: The average plant cover and average number of native plants in each seedling island ($n=10$) at the time of planting at Glenthorne Farm (Sept 2011), at the end of the first growing season (Dec 2011) and the end of the second growing season (Dec 2012). Plants were grown in 0.286 m² trays in a nursery for six months prior to planting, with two trays planted together to make one seedling island, giving an area of 0.571 m². Ten seeds each of eleven native herbaceous species were sown per tray, the species with living individuals at the time of counting are shown in the last column..... 98

Table 6.1: List of all identified weed species found on study plots at Glenthorne Farm. 272 plots, each 75 x 75 cm, were monitored eight times each between August 2011 and October 2012, making 2176 Plot Counts. This table shows the percentage of plot counts where each species was present, and the percentage of plot counts where the species was one of the two most dominant weed species in the plot at that time (determined by greatest % cover)..... 103

Table 6.2: List of all identified weed species found on study plots at Glenthorne Farm. There were 96 1 m x 1 m plots and each was monitored four times (Aug, Sep, Oct and Nov 2012) making 384 Plot Counts. The plots were split into four pre-planting weed control treatments; a control, herbicide spray only, topsoil removal (Scalp Only) and topsoil removal followed by herbicide spray 3 weeks later (Scalp+Herbicide). Values are the percentage of Plot Counts where each species was present for each treatment. 105

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 2.1:** Effects of four different treatments on the biomass and growth of four invasive annual grass species. Germinating seeds were planted in plots individually with either topsoil (Topsoil), topsoil plus ¼ teaspoon of sucrose (Carbon), topsoil under shade cloth (Shade) or subsoil >5 cm depth (Subsoil). Soil was collected from Glenthorne Farm, O'Halloran Hill, South Australia and plants were grown in a greenhouse and watered regularly for 11 weeks before harvesting and drying at 70°C for 72 hrs. Figures compare means of (a) shoot biomass, (b) root biomass, (c) total plant biomass, (d) root to shoot ratio, (e) height and (f) number of tillers. Error bars are \pm s.e.. Sample sizes range from 8 to 15 (Table 2.1). Different letters above bars for each species show significant differences at $\alpha = 0.05$ 27
- Figure 3.1:** Positioning of six plots sown with different seed densities within one treatment block. 41
- Figure 3.2:** Mean percentage cover for all Glenthorne Farm study plots. Cover was categorised as: Weeds – exotic herbaceous plants; Bare – bare ground; Litter – dead plant matter; and Native – seeded local native species. Plots were cleared in April 2011 and native seed applied in May 2011. 45
- Figure 3.3:** Box and whisker plots showing the percentage cover of; a) exotic weeds, b) bare ground and c) plant litter in 75 cm x 75 cm experimental plots at Glenthorne Farm. All vegetation was removed from the plots in May 2011. Plots were assigned one of five treatments; 3 monthly applications of sugar and sawdust (Carbon), removal of 5 cm of topsoil (Scalp), covering with shade cloth (Shade), location under tree canopies (Canopy) or no treatment (Control). Maximum whisker length is 1.5 x IQR, additional points are shown as outliers. Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric tests were used to determine differences amongst treatments for each season (** = $P < 0.001$; n.s. = not significant). Different letters under boxplots within each season show significant differences between treatments ($P < 0.05$) using Dunn's pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment. Letters in bold and filled boxes highlight treatments that were significantly different to the Control. 47
- Figure 3.4:** The number of a) graminoid, b) broadleaf and c) total exotic weed species recorded within 75 cm x 75 cm experimental plots at Glenthorne Farm. Plots were cleared of vegetation in May 2011 and allocated one of 5 treatments; 3 monthly applications of sugar and sawdust (Carbon Addition), removal of 5 cm of topsoil (Scalping), covering with shade cloth (Shade), location under tree canopies (Canopy) and a Control. Maximum whisker length is 1.5 x IQR. The Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test was used to determine differences amongst treatments for each season (** = $P < 0.001$). Different letters under boxplots within each season show significant differences between treatments ($P < 0.05$) using Dunn's pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment. Letters in bold and filled boxes highlight treatments that were significantly different to the Control. 48
- Figure 3.5:** Box and whisker plots showing the a) percentage cover, b) number of plants per plot and c) number of species of native plants sown from seed at Glenthorne Farm in May 2011. Plots were 75 cm x 75 cm and were cleared of vegetation prior to seeding. Plots were assigned one of five treatments; 3 monthly applications of sugar and sawdust (Carbon Addition), removal of 5 cm of topsoil (Scalp), covering with shade cloth (Shade), location under tree canopies (Canopy) and a Control. Seeds of 12 herbaceous species were planted at two densities (120 and 240 seeds/plot), but results were pooled as there were no significant differences at $\alpha = 0.05$. Whiskers extend to the 5th and 95th percentiles. Differences between treatments were all highly significant (** = $P < 0.001$). Different letters under boxplots within each season show significant differences between treatments ($P < 0.05$) using Dunn's pairwise comparisons with

Bonferroni adjustment. Letters in bold and filled boxes highlight treatments that were significantly different to the Control. 52

Figure 3.6: Box and whisker plots showing the percentage cover (a,b) and number of plants (c,d) per 75 cm x 75 cm plot of wallaby grasses (*Rytidosperma* spp.) during different seasons after planting at Glenthorne Farm in May 2011. Seeds were added to plots at low (35 seeds/plot) and high densities (70 seeds/plot). Plots had all vegetation removed in May 2011 and were assigned one of five treatments; 3 monthly applications of sugar and sawdust (Carbon), removal of 5 cm of topsoil (Scalp), covering with shade cloth (Shade), location under tree canopies (Canopy) and a Control. Whiskers represent the 5-95th percentiles. The Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test was used to determine differences amongst treatments for each season (***) = $P < 0.001$, ** = $P < 0.01$, * = $P < 0.05$, n.s. = not significant). Different letters under boxplots within each season show significant differences between treatments ($P < 0.05$) using Dunn's pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment. Letters in bold and filled boxes highlight treatments that were significantly different to the Control. 53

Figure 3.7: Box and whisker plots showing the percentage cover and number of plants per 75 cm x 75 cm plot of New Holland daisies (*Vittadinia gracilis*) during different seasons after planting at Glenthorne Farm in May 2011. Seeds were added to plots at low (15 seeds/plot) and high densities (30 seeds/plot) but results were pooled as there were no significant differences between seed density treatments at $\alpha = 0.05$. Plots had all vegetation removed in May 2011 and were assigned one of five treatments; 3 monthly applications of sugar and sawdust (Carbon), removal of 5 cm of topsoil (Scalp), covering with shade cloth (Shade), location under tree canopies (Canopy) and a Control. Whiskers represent the 5-95th percentiles. Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric tests were used to determine differences amongst treatments for each season (***) = $P < 0.001$). Different letters under boxplots within each season show significant differences between treatments ($P < 0.05$) using Dunn's pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment. Letters in bold and filled boxes highlight treatments that were significantly different to the Control. 54

Figure 4.1: The mean \pm s.e. of a) graminoid weed species, b) broadleaf weed species and c) total weed species within 1 m x 1 m experimental plots on Glenthorne Farm. Existing vegetation was removed from the plots in May 2012 using four different methods; manual removal with a mattock (Control), glyphosate application (Herbicide), topsoil removal using a grader (Scalp) and topsoil removal followed by glyphosate application 3 weeks later (Scalp + Herbicide). Graminoid and broadleaf weed species were recorded for each plot at the end of August, September, October and November 2012. One-way ANOVA was used to determine differences amongst treatments for each month (***) = $P < 0.001$, ** = $P < 0.01$, * = $P < 0.05$, n.s. = not significant). Different letters within each month show significant differences between treatments calculated using Tukey post-hoc tests ($P < 0.05$). 71

Figure 4.2: The median proportion of a) weed cover and b) weed species made up of graminoid (monocotyledonous) species compared with broadleaf (dicotyledonous) species within 1 m x 1 m experimental plots on Glenthorne Farm. Existing vegetation was removed from the plots in May 2012 using four different methods; manual removal with a mattock (Control), glyphosate application (Herbicide), topsoil removal using a grader (Scalp) and topsoil removal followed by glyphosate application 3 weeks later (Scalp + Herbicide). Percentage cover of graminoid and broadleaf weeds was recorded for each plot at the end of August, September, October and November 2012. Whiskers show the interquartile range. Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test was used to determine differences amongst treatments for each season (***) = $P < 0.001$; ** = $P < 0.01$; n.s. = not significant). Different letters under values within each month show significant differences between treatments calculated using Dunn's pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment ($P < 0.05$). 72

Figure 4.3: Box and whisker plots showing the percentage cover of a) graminoid weeds, b) broadleaf weeds and c) all weeds within 1 m x 1 m experimental plots on Glenthorne Farm. Existing vegetation was removed from the plots in May 2012 using four different methods; manual removal with a mattock (Control), glyphosate application (Herbicide), topsoil removal using a grader (Scalp) and topsoil removal followed by glyphosate application 3 weeks later (Scalp + Herbicide). Graminoid and broadleaf weed species were recorded for each plot at the end of August, September, October and November 2012. Maximum whisker length is 1.5 x IQR with additional points shown as outliers. Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to determine differences amongst treatments for each month (***) = $P < 0.001$, ** = $P < 0.01$, * = $P < 0.05$, n.s = not significant). Different letters under values within each month show significant differences between treatments calculated using Dunn's pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment ($P < 0.05$)..... 74

Figure 4.4: Box and whisker plot showing the percentage cover of bare ground in 1 m x 1 m experimental plots at Glenthorne Farm. Existing vegetation was removed from the plots in May 2012 using four different methods; manual removal with a mattock (Control), glyphosate application (Herbicide), topsoil removal using a grader (Scalp) and topsoil removal followed by glyphosate application 3 weeks later (Scalp + Herbicide). Percentage cover was recorded for each plot at the end of August, September, October and November 2012. Maximum whisker length is 1.5 x IQR, additional points are shown as outliers. The Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test was used to determine differences amongst treatments for each season (***) = $P < 0.001$; ** = $P < 0.01$; * = $P < 0.05$). Different letters under boxplots within each month show significant differences between treatments ($P < 0.05$) using Dunn's pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment. 75

Figure 4.5: The mean percentage cover of seeded native plants within 1 m x 1 m experimental plots on Glenthorne Farm. Existing vegetation was removed from the plots in May 2012 using four different methods; manual removal with a mattock (Control), glyphosate application (Herbicide), topsoil removal using a grader (Scalp) and topsoil removal followed by glyphosate application 3 weeks later (Scalp + Herbicide). Seeds were planted in June 2012. Percentage cover was recorded for each plot at the end of August, September, October and November 2012. One-way ANOVA was used to determine differences amongst treatments for each month (** = $P < 0.01$). Different letters above values within each month show significant differences between treatments calculated using Tukey post-hoc tests ($P < 0.05$). Error bars are \pm s.e..... 76

Figure 4.6: The mean a) percentage cover and b) number of individuals of seeded native grasses within 1 m x 1 m experimental plots on Glenthorne Farm. Existing vegetation was removed from the plots in May 2012 using four different methods; manual removal with a mattock (Control), glyphosate application (Herbicide), topsoil removal using a grader (Scalp) and topsoil removal followed by glyphosate application 3 weeks later (Scalp + Herbicide). Seeds of 4 *Rytidosperma* species and *Microlaena stipoides* were planted in June 2012. Percentage cover and number of individuals were recorded for each plot at the end of August, September, October and November 2012. One-way ANOVA was used to determine differences amongst treatments for each month (** = $P < 0.01$). Different letters under values within each month show significant differences between treatments calculated using Tukey post-hoc tests ($P < 0.05$). Error bars are \pm s.e. 78

Figure 4.7: The mean a) percentage cover and b) number of individuals of seeded native forbs within 1 m x 1 m experimental plots on Glenthorne Farm. Existing vegetation was removed from the plots in May 2012 using four different methods; manual removal with a mattock (Control), glyphosate application (Herbicide), topsoil removal using a grader (Scalp) and topsoil removal followed by glyphosate application 3 weeks later (Scalp + Herbicide). Seeds of *Vittadinia gracilis*, *Arthropodium strictum* and *Calostemma purpureum* were planted in June 2012. Percentage cover and number of individuals were recorded for each plot at the end of August, September,

October and November 2012. Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric tests were used to determine differences amongst treatments for each month (** = $P < 0.01$; *** = $P < 0.001$). Different letters under boxplots within each month show significant differences between treatments ($P < 0.05$) using Dunn's pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment..... 79

Figure 5.1: Total monthly rainfall for 2011 and 2012 and the long term mean rainfall at Happy Valley Reservoir (near Glenthorne Farm). Data from the Australian Bureau of Meteorology (www.bom.gov.au, accessed 17/11/2014.)..... 93

DECLARATION

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of The University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Emanuelle Gerlach _____ Date _____

ABSTRACT

In order to restore endangered native ecosystems such as Grey Box grassy woodlands, research is required on the establishment of native groundcover to ensure functioning ecosystems with greater structural complexity are created. Invasive, exotic plant species (weeds) are a major threat to restoration efforts. This study explores a variety of potential methods and strategies to control weeds in an effort to determine which ones may be effective in promoting the reestablishment of native understorey on previously farmed land.

The three main strategies tested were; carbon addition, topsoil removal and tree canopy planting. Carbon addition reduces the available soil nitrate and can inhibit nitrophilic weeds, topsoil removal depletes the weedy soil seed bank as well as soil nutrients, and trees are believed to outcompete weeds in some situations and facilitate native understorey establishment.

A glasshouse study was carried out to test the effects of these methods directly on common invasive annual grasses. Topsoil removal, tested by planting the grasses in subsoil collected from the field, reduced biomass of three out of four invasive annual grass species when compared with plants grown in topsoil. All four species had biomasses over 60% lower than the control when carbon was added, whereas shade had no effect.

This was followed by a field experiment at Glenthorne Farm, O'Halloran Hill, South Australia. Plots were set up with five treatments; carbon addition, topsoil removal, artificial shade, natural shade under tree canopies and a control. Plots were cleared initially and the reestablishment of weeds monitored for 18 months. Native seeds were also sown and the survival of any germinants monitored. Carbon addition plots had decreased weed cover but no increase in native species establishment compared to the controls. Topsoil removal plots had the lowest percentage weed cover and also the

highest number and cover of native plants. Shade and tree canopy treatments did not reduce the cover of weeds and native species establishment was very low.

Topsoil removal was the most effective method in the above experiment, and a second trial was set up at Glenthorne Farm to test this method further. Larger tracts of land were scalped and some of these were also sprayed with herbicide three weeks after topsoil removal to further reduce the number of weeds subsequently germinating from the soil seed bank. Total weed cover was not significantly reduced on topsoil removal plots compared to controls, but native species establishment was higher.

After analysing these results, some of my recommendations for improving the revegetation of native groundcover from seed on former agricultural land include:

- Ensuring topsoil removal is to a relevant depth and following up with herbicide applications or other weed removal methods to ensure the soil seed bank is sufficiently depleted before planting;
- Where native species already grow, carbon addition can be used to inhibit some weeds, such as nitrophilic annual grasses, although it may not be appropriate to use while native species are germinating;
- Groundcover species should be planted at the same time or before tree species as the shade and increased fertility under tree canopies can promote the growth of some weed species.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing a Doctorate thesis is a long and difficult process that I could never have accomplished without the assistance and support of a number of people. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor David Paton whose contributions, advice and editing have been invaluable. I would also like to thank;

- My parents, who have helped me a lot, both physically out in the field at Glenthorne Farm digging up plots, as well as emotionally, encouraging me to persevere.
- Martin, the caretaker of Glenthorne Farm for unlocking the gate for me every day and pulling my car out of the mud when I got bogged.
- Greg Dalton and his staff for looking after my plants in the nursery and the slashing, scalping and spraying work they carried out at Glenthorne Farm.
- Rob Cirocco for his assistance in the greenhouse
- Colin Bailey, Tom Hunt and the Friends of Glenthorne Farm members who helped me to set up my field experiments.

A special cheers to the folk of Room 118 for the random chats and important frustration venting (Amanda McLean, Tim Richards, Rebecca West, Casey O'Brien etc.). Most importantly I'd like to thank my partner Kaetlyn for her eternal patience and much needed support.