

**CHARLES STURT**  
UNIVERSITY



JOHNSTONE CENTRE  
Report No. 178

Identifying Best Management Practices for  
Riparian Habitats in Gippsland Dairy Regions:  
Riparian Condition and Relationships with  
Farm Management.

Leigh Thompson, Alistar Robertson, Amy Jansen & Peter Davies



April 2003  
Wagga Wagga, NSW

Johnstone Centre, Wagga Wagga, NSW

All rights reserved. The contents of this publication are copyright in all countries subscribing to the Berne Convention. No parts of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, in existence or to be invented, including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the written permission of the authors, except where permitted by law.

Cataloguing in Publication provided by the National Library of Australia

Identifying best management practices for riparian habitats in Gippsland dairy regions: riparian condition and relationships with farm management.

Bibliography.

ISBN 1 86467 130 0.

1. Riparian ecology – Victoria – Gippsland. 2. Dairying, Environmental aspects – Victoria – Gippsland. I. Thompson, Leigh, 1979-. II. Charles Sturt University. Johnstone Centre. III. Title (Series: Report (Charles Sturt University. Johnstone Centre); no. 178).

577.68273099456

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The authors wish to acknowledge the important contributions of all of the landowners in the west and south Gippsland region who allowed access to their properties and who took part in interviews. We would also like to thank Carol Bradshaw and Sharon Aarons for their help with establishing the context for the project, logistic support in Gippsland and introductions to dairy farmers. We thank Phil Taylor, Clare Lamers, Martin Fuller and Coralie Pickett for helping to establish contact with dairy farmers. John Bowman and Paul Devlin also provided useful advice during the early phase of the project. The study was supported by a grant from Land and Water Australia. Charles Sturt University's Ethics & Human Research Committee granted approval for this project (02/128).

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report presents the findings of a field project undertaken in the west and south Gippsland region of Victoria between May and December 2002. The specific aims of this project were: (1) to determine the current condition of riparian (streamside) habitats across the west and south Gippsland dairy region, (2) to investigate the relationships between landholder management practices and riparian condition, and (3) to make recommendations for management practices that could be investigated at demonstration sites planned for the region.

2. We surveyed 107 riparian sites and conducted 28 landholder interviews to gain information on the variation in the ecological condition of riparian habitats and management practices among farmers.

3. We used a rapid appraisal index of riparian condition developed in previous studies on the impacts of cattle on riparian habitats (Jansen & Robertson 2001a) and modified it for use in the Gippsland dairy region. Scoring of variables used in the index was based on surveys of seven reference sites in the Gippsland region. We stratified our sampling of sites according to landform (Gippsland Plain=flat sites; Strezlecki Ranges=hilly sites) and broad management categories for riparian habitats encountered in the region (grazed, planted after fencing, fenced remnants of riparian vegetation).

4. The farm sizes, herd numbers and stocking rates of the 28 farms we visited for interviews were typical of dairy farms in Gippsland. Farms visited were typically small (most <200ha) with herd sizes that result in mean annual stocking rates of 25-73 DSE.ha<sup>-1</sup>.annum<sup>-1</sup>. In most cases farmers used 100% of their properties for pasture production to support their milking herds. Most paddocks that contained streambank habitat were managed in the same way as other paddocks, except when they were very wet, when farmers removed stock.

5. Eighty-four percent of farmers interviewed had fenced-off some portion of their riparian areas from stock. The most common reason given for fencing was for stock management purposes. Nevertheless, the very active Landcare groups in the region

point to the number of dairy farmers with a motivation to conserve streambanks and biodiversity by fencing and replanting riparian habitats.

6. The current condition of riparian sites on dairy farms in south and west Gippsland is generally very poor, with no significant differences between sites in the flat terrain of the Gippsland Plain or hilly terrain of the Strzelecki Ranges. Riparian sites in paddocks that are used for livestock grazing of milking herds are generally in very poor condition. Sites in best condition are those in patches of remnant riparian forest that had been fenced-off to prevent stock access.

7. In-stream metabolism (often used as an ecosystem measure of river “health”) was measured at a sub-set of 20 sites. Metabolism showed a gradient of values over the sites and was dominated by high rates of respiration; probably a function of elevated nutrient status. The condition index scores from the rapid assessments were correlated to in-stream primary production and respiration. This indicates a relationship between riparian condition and shows how rapid measures (index coefficient) are valuable surrogate measures of in-stream condition.

8. Riparian sites that had been fenced-off and replanted (=planted sites in our terminology) generally received a low condition index score owing to the short time that had elapsed since site works. There was a significant, positive linear relationship between site condition and the time since rehabilitation work was completed, with more than 16 years required for planted sites to attain an excellent condition index score.

9. There was no statistically significant relationship between stocking rate and the index of riparian condition on dairy farms in Gippsland and there was only a very weak negative relationship between cowpat counts (our index of livestock activity in the riparian zone) and condition scores. There was also no evidence that the positioning of alternative watering points on dairy farms in Gippsland had resulted in better condition index scores for riparian sites. Thus, two generic best practices recommended for riparian habitats - rotations of stock in riparian paddocks and the provision of off-stream watering points will not be effective in rehabilitating riparian habitats under the current stocking rates used on Gippsland dairy farms.

10. Our results also indicated that condition index values for fenced remnants of riparian vegetation reached a plateau when vegetation was 30 metres wide on either side of a stream. Thus it appears that such a width is required in the Gippsland dairy region to obtain an excellent condition score.

11. The following recommendations regarding best practice arise directly from the results of this study.

- Rehabilitation of degraded riparian sites currently subject to direct access by dairy cows is best achieved by fencing-off riparian areas so they are inaccessible to cattle. Other recommended practices such as the provision of off-stream watering points and ‘spelling’ of riparian paddocks are not effective on dairy farms in Gippsland under current stocking rates.
- In order to restore riparian sites to somewhere near excellent condition (as measured by our index of riparian condition) fenced riparian strips will need to be at least 30 metres wide on either side of a stream or river.
- When siting new dairy sheds on farms, they should be as far away from streams as possible.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	vii
1.0 INTRODUCTION	9
2.0 BACKGROUND	9
2.1 Dairy Industry in west and south Gippsland .....	9
2.2 Identifying Best Management Practices for riparian habitats in west and south Gippsland dairy regions .....	11
2.3 This study .....	12
3.0 METHODS	12
3.1 Study region .....	12
3.2 Study design .....	15
3.3 Landholder interviews .....	16
3.4 Ecological condition and rapid appraisal .....	17
4.0 RESULTS	23
4.1 Dairy farmer interviews .....	23
4.2 Condition of riparian sites and relationships with dairy farm management .....	26
5.0 DISCUSSION	35
5.1 Dairy farm management and riparian condition .....	35
5.2 Recommendations .....	38
6.0 REFERENCES	40
APPENDICES	43
Appendix 1a-d. Ecological Vegetation Class (EVC) for bioregions of Strezlecki Ranges and Gippsland Plain.....	44
Appendix 2. Farmer interview sheet .....	50
Appendix 3. Field data sheet for rapid assessments of riparian condition .....	55
Appendix 4. Methodology for scoring of condition index.....	57
Appendix 5 Relationship between condition index and in-stream metabolism.....	58
Appendix 6 Relationship between grazing, condition index and bird communities...	61
Appendix 7. Dry Sheep Equivalent (DSE) conversion table for different breeds of dairy cattle .....	63
Appendix 8. (a). Mean scores for condition sub-indices against overall condition categories. (b). Stepwise regression of sub-indices on total condition index scores ..	64

# LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

## FIGURES

- Figure 1.** Map of the study area showing the south and west Gippsland dairy regions and the location of the survey and reference sites..... 13
- Figure 2.** A summary of the study design. Each of the 4 bottom level groups contained 25-30 individual riparian sites (n=107) ..... 16
- Figure 3.** Frequency of condition index score categories for riparian sites subject to different management on dairy farms in south and west Gippsland. Data pooled among both flat and hilly regions..... 27
- Figure 4.** Mean (+ 95% CL) condition index scores for riparian sites subject to different management on dairy farms in flat and hilly regions of west and south Gippsland ..... 27
- Figure 5.** Condition index scores for fenced and replanted riparian sites of different age in flat and hilly regions of west and south Gippsland ..... 29
- Figure 6.** Condition of riparian sites plotted against the mean annual stocking rate for the dairy farms on which the surveys were conducted. Data are for grazed sites only..... 30
- Figure 7.** For grazed riparian sites, condition plotted against the number of cowpats (used as an indicator of cow activity)..... 31
- Figure 8.** For planted riparian sites, condition plotted against the number of cowpats counted at the site. Although fenced-off, half of the planted sites (17 of 34) were still accessible by cows or were very narrow plantings ..... 31
- Figure 9.** The condition of riparian sites plotted against the distance from the riparian site to the dairy shed used for milking. Analysis restricted to sites subject to grazing by the dairy herd..... 32
- Figure 10.** The condition of riparian sites plotted against the distance from the riparian site to the nearest artificial watering point (trough or dam). Analysis restricted to sites subject to grazing by the dairy herd..... 32
- Figure 11.** Condition of grazed and planted (fenced) riparian sites on dairy farms plotted against total farm size (ns = not significant) ..... 33
- Figure 12.** Condition of grazed and planted (fenced) riparian sites on dairy farms plotted against the area of the farm used for grazing (ns = not significant)..... 33

<b>Figure 13.</b> Relationship between the width of remnant patches of riparian vegetation and the condition index scores for the sites. Note that the metric associated with the width of riparian vegetation was excluded from the calculation of the condition index scores .....	34
--	----

## TABLES

<b>Table 1.</b> Functions of the riparian zone at different levels of organisation, the components of the riparian ecosystem which perform those functions, and the indicators of the function as used in this study .....	19
<b>Table 2.</b> Classification of the seven reference sites according to bioregions and locations, and brief descriptions of the vegetation structure at each site .....	20
<b>Table 3.</b> Size and tenure attributes for dairy farms where interviews were conducted with landholders (n=28 farms) .....	23
<b>Table 4.</b> Milking herd size and stock management practices on dairy farms where interviews were conducted with landholders (n=28 farms) .....	23
<b>Table 5.</b> Irrigation and effluent management practices on dairy farms where interviews were conducted with landholders (n=28 farms) .....	24
<b>Table 6.</b> Attributes of river creek frontages and management practices related to riparian areas on dairy farms where interviews were conducted with landholders (n=28 farms) .....	25
<b>Table 7.</b> The introduction of new resource management practices on dairy farms where interviews were conducted with landholders (n=28 farms) .....	25
<b>Table 8.</b> Analysis of variance for condition index scores for riparian areas subject to different management on dairy farms in flat and hilly regions of south and west Gippsland (***, $p < 0.001$ ); g=grazed, p=planted, r=remnant. Note, fenced but not planted sites not included in the analysis .....	28
<b>Table 9.</b> Summary of analyses of variance for mean scores of the five components of the condition index in riparian sites under different management (r= remnant sites, p=planted sites, g=grazed) on dairy farms in different regions (flat, hilly) of south and west Gippsland. **, $p < 0.01$ ; ***, $p < 0.001$ ; ns = not significant. Results are shown of post-hoc comparisons of means .....	28