



**Australian Government**  

---

**Rural Industries Research and  
Development Corporation**

# **Dividing the droplet**

**– A water balance study for lucerne seed production  
resourced by an underground aquifer**

**A Short Report for the Rural Industries  
Research and Development Corporation**

by James De Barro

August 2005

RIRDC Publication No 05/116  
RIRDC Project No. DEB-3A

© 2005 Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation.  
All rights reserved.

ISBN 1 74151 179 8  
ISSN 1440-6845

**Dividing the droplet – A water balance study for lucerne seed production resourced by an underground aquifer**

*Publication No. 05/116*

*Project No. DEB-3A*

The information contained in this publication is intended for general use to assist public knowledge and discussion and to help improve the development of sustainable industries. The information should not be relied upon for the purpose of a particular matter. Specialist and/or appropriate legal advice should be obtained before any action or decision is taken on the basis of any material in this document. The Commonwealth of Australia, Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation, the authors or contributors do not assume liability of any kind whatsoever resulting from any person's use or reliance upon the content of this document.

This publication is copyright. However, RIRDC encourages wide dissemination of its research, providing the Corporation is clearly acknowledged. For any other enquiries concerning reproduction, contact the Publications Manager on phone 02 6272 3186.

**Researcher Contact Details**

James De Barro  
De Barro Agricultural Consulting  
P.O. Box 424  
KEITH SA 5267

Phone: 08 8755 3400  
Fax: 08 8755 3422  
Email: dbac@lm.net.au

**RIRDC Contact Details**

Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation  
Level 1, AMA House  
42 Macquarie Street  
BARTON ACT 2600  
PO Box 4776  
KINGSTON ACT 2604

Phone: 02 6272 4539  
Fax: 02 6272 5877  
Email: rirdc@rirdc.gov.au  
Website: <http://www.rirdc.gov.au>

Published in August 2005  
Printed on environmentally friendly paper by Union Offset

# Foreword

Irrigated lucerne seed production in the Keith region of the Upper South East of South Australia is resourced by underground aquifers. The South Australian Government through its Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation is changing the licensing system from an area based system with no cap on the quantity of water pumped to a metered licensing system with allocated permissible pumping volumes. Irrigated lucerne seed producers currently have no quantified understanding of the water balance of their production methods and consequently there is no data to support their claim for a fair and equitable licence conversion.

The research was designed to develop a methodology suitable for quantifying the water balance for both check bank guided flood irrigation and centre pivot irrigation. A method was developed to measure the water pumped, losses to evaporation and drainage as well as lucerne water use. Conducted over three irrigation seasons the project provided excellent data for irrigators to use as supporting evidence through the licence conversion process.

This report includes rationale for the research, a brief outline of the methodology and the summarised data collected from the project. The results are presented in a format that can be used both by irrigators, the irrigation industry, as well as the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation as part of the licence conversion process.

This project is funded by De Barro Agricultural Consulting and industry revenue that is matched by funds provided by the Australian Government.

This report is an addition to RIRDC's diverse range of over 1200 research publications, forms part of our Pasture Seeds R&D program, which aims to facilitate the growth of a profitable and sustainable pasture seeds industry based on a reputation for the reliable supply, domestically and internationally, of a range of pasture species.

Most of our publications are available for viewing, downloading or purchasing online through our website:

- downloads at [www.rirdc.gov.au/reports/Index.htm](http://www.rirdc.gov.au/reports/Index.htm)
- purchases at [www.rirdc.gov.au/eshop](http://www.rirdc.gov.au/eshop)

**Peter O'Brien**

Managing Director

Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation

# Acknowledgments

The author wishes to acknowledge the co-operation of Makin Farms, Don and Heather Cook, Mardango Props, Nigel Densley, Kernel Pty Ltd in providing land for trial purposes. Additionally RIRDC, SECWMB, DWLBC, Vermeeren Bros. Engineering, Measuring and Control Equipment Company, Agrilink, and staff of De Barro Agricultural Consulting are acknowledged for their contributions.

## About the author

James De Barro owns and manages De Barro Agricultural Consulting. James has an honours degree in Agricultural Science and a Graduate Diploma of Business and was awarded a Churchill Fellowship in 2000. James resides in Keith in South Australia and specialises in consulting to lucerne seed producers and industry regarding all facets of seed production in dryland and irrigated systems. James is responsible for the ongoing research focus of the business that finances several projects.

**Nothing in life is to be feared. It is only to be understood.**

Madame Curie

# Contents

Foreword.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
About the author .....	iv
List of Tables and Charts .....	vi
Executive Summary .....	vii
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Lucerne seed industry .....	1
1.2 Water Resource Issues .....	1
<b>2. Objectives.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Research Aims .....	3
<b>3. Methodology – a general outline .....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 Research plan .....	4
3.2 Site selection .....	4
3.3 Research Tools.....	4
3.4 Deep drainage .....	5
3.5 Water balance calculation .....	5
<b>4. Results .....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1 Lucerne production .....	7
4.2 Soil types and water quality .....	7
4.3 Weather and crop growing period.....	7
<b>5. Implications for irrigators.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6. Implications for policy makers.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>7. Recommendations .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>8. Communications strategy .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>9. References .....</b>	<b>18</b>

# List of Tables and Charts

**Table 1:** Irrigation site soil type and the salinity of water used for irrigating. 7

**Table 2:** Temperature, relative humidity and rainfall through the irrigation periods for each site over each year of the project. 7

**Table 3a-b:** Irrigation times. 8

**Table 3c-e:** Irrigation times. 9

**Tables 4 & 5:** Water balance results. 10

**Tables 6 & 7:** Water balance results. 11

**Table 8:** Water balance results. 12

# Executive Summary

*Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*  
(lucky is he who has been able to understand the causes of things)

With the impending changes to irrigation licences posing questions over the sustainability of irrigation practices and the aquifer, this research serves both immediate and longer term requirements for improved understanding of the current irrigation systems used.

Since the commencement of irrigated lucerne seed production in the Keith region, no recorded attempt has been made to quantify or qualify the irrigation systems used. Such information is the foundation data required for assessing the systems' efficiency and any areas of likely improvement as well as the impact of irrigation on the quality and quantity of the aquifer.

The aim of the research was to determine what does happen to the water pumped from the aquifer for the purpose of lucerne seed production. The research methodology used is simple and repeatable. The methodology for this indicative type of research project amalgamates the use of several commercially available instruments into an excellent process for quantifying the lucerne water balance. The methods used were so successful that they have become the model for the South Australian Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation Volumetric Conversion Project for the entire South East region of South Australia.

Additionally the research methodology can be used for extended irrigation efficiency studies that could result in improvements in irrigation delivery and crop yield. Whilst the project was not aimed to investigate irrigation efficiency, it did by design, assess the efficiency of irrigation delivery. The following general observations were made from the findings.

The research showed that, specifically for lucerne seed production, a fixed centre pivot in good working order that was irrigated according to crop water requirements and active root depth was 36.4% more efficient than the most efficient flood irrigated lucerne seed crop and about 70% more efficient than the worst performed flood irrigation.

Provided water quality is not in excess of 3000 ppm total dissolved salts a conventional centre pivot or lateral flow could be an alternative to flood irrigating lucerne seed crops. Compromises to this include capitalising the conversion of irrigation delivery and environmental factors such as tree removal. Modifications to centre pivots such as drop tubes could present opportunities for their use with water of significantly higher salinities.

The efficiency of a shifttable, shared centre pivot declines significantly compared to a fixed system due to compromises in irrigation timing.

Flood irrigation efficiency is expressed as a high percentage of pumped water that is used by the crop. This depends largely on the flow rate of the water pumped, sealing properties of the delivery channel and the irrigation bay slope and soil type. The configuration of bay size/slope in relation to the flow rate impacted on the eventual percentage of pumped water used by the crop. The research found that between 25% and 59% of the pumped water is used by the lucerne seed crop, the remainder mostly lost through drainage and only minimal losses due to evaporation. The findings indicate that there is substantial room for improvement in the efficiency of flood irrigated lucerne seed production.

Hay production from flood irrigation and pivot irrigation required nearly twice as much water to be pumped which is directly related to the increased number of required irrigations. In the case of the flood irrigated crop the percentage of pumped water used by the lucerne for hay production was no different than the seed crop the previous year. Since the same percentage of pumped water is required

by lucerne in hay and seed production, hay production is not necessarily any less or more efficient but by virtue of the number of irrigations requires significantly more water than seed production.

Aside from developing a method for evaluating irrigation efficiency, the research achieved its aim of determining the water balance for irrigated lucerne seed production. The benefits of this research are that the results will support irrigator's requests for defined water quantities in the licence conversion process. The conversion process should not be a system to reduce or increase licence allocations but rather a process of simply converting the current licence format into another, more useful format. Any changes to allocations must be on the basis of confirmed knowledge of aquifer sustainability – particularly in respect of salinity and recharge.

The research determined that for flood irrigation in the defined region an irrigator requires between 7 and 14 ML of water for every hectare irrigated for lucerne seed production. The quantity required depends on both the existing infrastructure of the irrigated area and environment being irrigated. There are many factors influencing the quantity required, including soil type, channel design, pump flow rate, bay size and slope. Some factors, such as soil type and possibly slope, can not be altered but bay size, channel design, delivery system and flow rate may be modified to improve efficiency and hence reduce the quantity required per hectare of seed producing area.

The defined quantity of water required by the irrigated lucerne seed producer to continue their current practice is now established. The conversion of licences should be relatively straight forward, at least on the mathematical level. The contentious issue will arise if and when the conversion process results in cuts to the volumes required to maintain the current status quo, especially if the cuts are not based on quantified and qualified reasoning.



# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Lucerne seed industry

### 1.1.1 General Overview

The Australian lucerne seed industry produces in excess of 5,000 tonne of seed per financial year of which over 90% is produced in South Australia. Over 8,000 ha of irrigated seed production occurs in the Upper South East of South Australia and at least 85% of Australia's total lucerne seed production is produced in the Project's research region, Keith, South Australia. The export value of lucerne seed exceeds \$A 13.5 million a value which is steadily increasing. The increasing value of lucerne seed to the Australian pasture seed industry defines it as a commodity that requires research designed to maintain and improve yields and grower returns. As an intensive high input crop there is a requirement for sustainable practices that are acceptable with the environmental issues impacting on primary production in today's world.

### 1.1.2 Research Area

Lucerne seed production in the research region is the district's key crop. By virtue of the naturally saline ground water, lucerne is the most reliable perennial crop as it persists and provides profitable seed yields for the region's irrigators, and in particular, border check flood irrigators. The irrigation of lucerne for seed production adds significant economic and social stability for the communities concerned.

## 1.2 Water Resource Issues

### 1.2.1 Licencing System

Across most of the South East of South Australia a ground water resource exists in the form of unconfined and confined aquifers. The South East of South Australia is divided into regional Prescribed Wells Areas and the common source of flood irrigation water for lucerne seed production is in the Tatiara Prescribed Wells Region. Salinity in this area ranges from 2000 to in excess of 7000 mg/l and is the water source central to the conducted research. In 1984 the Tatiara region (incorporating the Keith area) was prescribed due to concerns of increasing water salinity. The development of an area based volumetric water allocation system based on estimated crop water requirements was instituted in 1988. The ground water allocation plan was an Irrigation Equivalent System where the allowable area of any irrigated crop to be grown was relative to the water use of a "standard area and type" of pasture referred to as the 'reference crop'. This system operates on an estimation of the water use of the crop to be grown and is currently in use across the Upper South East of South Australia. The licence provides *no limit* on the volume of water than can be pumped from the aquifer to irrigate lucerne for seed production but only specifies the area upon which any volume of irrigation can be applied.

Historically land in South Australia has been divided into Hundreds for the purposes of simplifying government management. Within the Tatiara Prescribed Wells Area the Hundred of Stirling is Australia's biggest lucerne seed production area and as a result is a highly concentrated area of border check flood irrigation. In 1997 detailed crop area ratios were created in the Hundred of Stirling as a result of proactive irrigators concerned that water withdrawal was greater than the annual recharge of the aquifer system which was associated with a noted rise in water salinity. Allocation reductions were instituted and new crop area ratios created to allow producers to best use their reduced allocation for their production practices. This was the first exhibited licence change, organised by irrigators and State Government water resource representatives, that was directly in response to the notion of the importance of water quantities pumped and the impact this has on the ground water system.

### **1.2.2 Water Resource Management Framework**

The Water Resource Act 1997 was created to permit specific water resource management where deemed necessary. Such management would have as its aim the sustainability of the water resource. The Tatiara Prescribed Wells Area is one of five management areas in the South East where the Act required a water allocation plan to be created. A State Government Select Committee Report on Water Allocations in the South East was released in August 1999 and created the framework for the South East Catchment Water Management Board (SEWCMB), which was formed under the Act, to be empowered in consultation with the community, to produce water allocation plans to replace existing water allocation policies. The Tatiara Prescribed Wells Area and the Tintinara/Coonalpyn Prescribed Wells Area constitute the designated area of research although the research will have bearing on lucerne seed production in the Padthaway Prescribed Area. Along with the SEWCMB, the State Government Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (DWLBC) is undertaking the research and community consultation aspect of the water allocation licence changes in accordance to the revised water allocation plans.

### **1.2.3 Licence Conversion**

The water allocation licence changes will convert the current area based licences to volumetric licences. Such licences will provide the irrigator with a set volume of water that will be permitted to be pumped from the aquifer in any given year. Consequently the irrigator will not be restricted in the area irrigated.

## **2. Objectives**

### **2.1 Research Aims**

#### **2.1.1 Purpose of research**

The development of a new water allocation licence system to replace the current irrigation equivalent system is complex and emotive. Environmental, social, economic and agricultural factors need to be well researched and considered so a fair and equitable system of conversion can be created. Such a conversion needs to be based on solid quantified data collected through appropriate research. The research needs to determine what quantities are currently required by irrigators to maintain their current status quo. Unless the research determines significant sustainability issues and can provide solutions to the problems, any reductions in licences should not be part of the conversion process. The conversion process should simply change the type of licence without any major changes to current irrigation practices.

The irrigated lucerne seed producer's ability to irrigate provides an opportunity to produce an income that otherwise would not be possible or obtain yields above that of a dryland system. The right to irrigate comes with inherited responsibilities to use the resource in an efficient and ecologically sustainable manner. Such responsibility is under increasing political and social scrutiny as the demand for the resource increases. Present day and future lucerne seed irrigators need to be seen by all sections of the community to be actively researching a solution to efficient and effective water use thereby justifying existing demand for irrigation in a sustainable system. The research will provide benchmark information upon which to develop improvements in efficiency whilst at least maintaining production and will be evidence to relevant government authorities and communities of irrigators consciousness of the importance of developing management systems that permit profitable yet ecologically sustainable irrigation water use.

The irrigators require their own independent research to collect data that can be used to support their interests in the conversion process. They need to be an active participant in the research so as to achieve a fair and equitable result.

The underground water system has been exposing symptoms of fragility such as increasing salinity and decline in water table depth for over a decade. The creation of an accurate knowledge base would allow for refined allocation of the underground water for flood irrigation of lucerne seed hence an immediate advance in sustainable and efficient water use. This in turn assists in securing the availability of the quantity and quality of the water resource for the future.

## **3. Methodology – a general outline**

The following is a general outline of the research methodology. Full details are presented in the detailed report (RIRDC publication no. W05/119), which is available on the RIRDC website ([www.rirdc.gov.au](http://www.rirdc.gov.au)).

### **3.1 Research plan**

The research undertook a water audit by measuring water pumped from the aquifer, lucerne seed crop water use, evaporative losses from the irrigation channel and flood bay, soil water storage and the percentage of water return back to the aquifer beyond the lucerne root zone. The data would test the underlying assumptions of crop water use upon which the crop area ratio system is based. The research would also create necessary benchmark data for use in further research aimed at improving the efficiency of irrigation systems using the underground water resource.

### **3.2 Site selection**

Five field trials were created in established Hunter River lucerne seed crops in the Keith region of South Australia. Four of the trial sites were situated on soil types typical of border check flood irrigation in the Tatiara Prescribed Wells area. A fifth site was established under a centre pivot to assist in refining lucerne water use data. This site was located in the Tintinara Coonalpyn Prescribed Wells Area. The lucerne seed crops had a uniform plant density of 20 or more plants /m<sup>2</sup>.

### **3.3 Research Tools**

Collection of relevant data for the research was achieved with the following equipment:

#### **3.3.1 Weather stations**

Temperature, relative humidity, solar radiation, leaf wetness and wind speed were continuously recorded by data loggers to provide data for determining potential evapotranspiration which was used in crop water use calculations. Each site had a rainfall gauge that automatically recorded rainfall quantities.

#### **3.3.2 Soil moisture recording**

The flood sites had three soil moisture monitoring sites per bay and one soil moisture monitoring sites was established in the centre pivot. The sites continuously recorded soil moisture levels to a 1.5 m depth. The Agrilink C-probe<sup>R</sup> soil moisture sensors, which measured soil moisture by capacitance, were located directly in and below the root zone of the lucerne.

#### **3.3.3 Monitoring wells**

Two flood sites each had one monitoring well established. The well was situated in the middle of the bay and was constructed to the same depth as the irrigation bore supplying the irrigation water. Each well had a continuously recording water level sensor installed.

#### **3.3.4 Water metering**

Each flood irrigation pump was fitted with a MACE 2 inch insert type ultrasonic flow meter. The total volume pumped while irrigating the flood bay and the rate of water pumping was recorded. The duration of irrigation of the flood sites was recorded by placing a depth logger at the irrigation outlet gate to the bay. The logger recorded the depth of the water moving out from the channel through the irrigation gate and the time of irrigation was a function of the depth of the water passing over it when the gate was opened and closed.

### **3.3.5 Evaporative losses**

Channel evaporative losses were measured at each irrigation and from the flood bay surface prior to the crop canopy developing using the relevant recorded weather data.

### **3.3.6 Channel drainage**

Channel drainage was calculated using a pondage test. The channel was closed and filled to the irrigation level and the rate of water surface level decline was measured at peak fill when head pressure for seepage was maximised.

### **3.3.7 Irrigation timing**

Dataflow Systems 392 depth loggers were used to record the commencement and completion of each irrigation event.

## **3.4 Deep drainage**

Drainage of applied irrigation water through the soil profile back into the ground water is a difficult measurement to determine with absolute accuracy. Any installation of equipment vertically into the soil profile for the purpose of measuring drainage, by virtue of the installation procedure, will compromise the draining passage of water. To date this has been the standard means of installing drainage metering devices. Ideally it would be more appropriate to excavate horizontally into the soil profile at the depth of interest and measure moisture draining from above but this is inappropriate and impractical for the research sites. The monitoring wells record a rapid rise in the groundwater following flood irrigation and a slow steady rise in the non irrigation season. Dryland drainage as observed in caves underground is a slow and constant process, often not visually influenced by periods of wet or drier weather. Changes in water table levels are more influenced by recharge from runaway holes than they are from localised drainage through the soil profile – at least this appears to be the case in the research area. Consequently, after examining differing methods of attempting to measure drainage beyond the root zone of lucerne seed crops, the research project decided to use an interpolative approach.

## **3.5 Water balance calculation**

The monitoring wells established the relationship between flood irrigation and drainage to the ground water table from where the water was pumped. Additionally it established a link between pumping and the draw down of the ground water towards the pump. The time of a ground water response to the localised flood irrigation event varied depending on the dryness of the root zone and varied between 6 and 12 hours. With this relationship proven a simple mathematical approach was possible.

Given the research project involved only 5 sites its findings would be relative rather than absolute. Consequently a mathematical approach using the best data possible would provide the best and only available guide to the water balance. The approach was based on concentrating efforts to measure as accurately as possible the water pumped, the losses from the channel due to drainage and evaporation, the evaporative losses from the irrigated area, the crop water use and the residual water stored in the active root zone. Detailed analysis of the soil moisture records in combination with estimated crop water requirements between full and refill points to grow a commercial lucerne seed crop allowed estimation of the readily available water, crop water needs and any residual soil moisture left in the root zone prior to each irrigation and at the point of harvest. By calculating all these factors, and accepting that below the irrigated lucerne root zone the soil would always be saturated, it was possible to estimate the drainage volume.

A = water pumped

B = channel drainage

C = evaporative losses from channel surface and bay surface (or pivot application)

D = lucerne seed crop or hay crop use

E = residual water stored in root zone throughout irrigation season

F = drainage to groundwater

$$F = A - (B + C + D + E)$$

Although the drainage portion was calculated, the rate of drainage cannot. However the monitoring wells indicate the frequency of recharge, and compared with the soil moisture monitoring records through the years it indicated that drainage never ceases. Rather the recharge from runaway holes only increases the rate at which ground water rises above the 'background' drainage rate and the rate at which an irrigation created zone of depression recedes.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Lucerne production

In the 2000/01 and 2001/02 all the crops at each site were irrigated for seed production, commencing in early-mid December and being harvested in the late March to mid April period. In 2002/03 one flood paddock (Site 1, Table 2) and the centre pivot paddock (Site 5, Table 2) were irrigated for hay production with the other three flood sites being irrigated for seed production.

### 4.2 Soil types and water quality

Table 1 presents the soil type of each irrigation site and the salinity of water used for irrigating.

Site	Soil Type	Water Salinity (ppm)
1	Sand (0-2m); Clay/limestone(2-9m); Sand/Limestone/Marl (9-16m)	3000
2	Sandy loam & limestone (0-0.8m); Limestone/marl (0.8-15m)	7500
3	Loamy sand & limestone (0-1.2m); Limestone/marl (1.2-15m)	4150
4	Loamy sand & limestone (0-1.2m); Limestone/marl (1.2-15m)	5300
5	Sandy loam (0-1m); sand and limestone(1-20m)	2500

Site 1 (flood): Brimbago – E140°457', S36°274'.

Site 2 (flood): Keith west - E140°306', S36°123'.

Site 3 (flood): Keith south - E140°361', S36°161'

Site 4 (flood): Mt Monster - E140°314', S36°194'

Site 5 (pivot): Coombe - E140°258', S35°982'

From Table 1, sites 2, 3 and 4 have similar soil types typical of a significant majority of flood irrigation land in the Hundred of Stirling in the Tatiara Prescribed Wells Area. Site 1 is representative of another area of significant flood irrigation in the Tatiara Prescribed Wells Area. Site 5 is located in the Tintinara Coonalpyn Prescribed Wells Area and is representative of significant areas of pivot irrigation, particularly in the Hundred of Archibald.

The water storage capacity of soils typical of the irrigation area varies depending on soil type. Sites 2, 3 and 4 hold about 75-80 mm in the active root zone when at full point. Site 5 being deeper sand holds 95 mm and site 1 holds 130 mm. This factor dictates the number and frequency of irrigations through the seed production period.

### 4.3 Weather and crop growing period

Table 2 presents the temperature, relative humidity and rainfall through the irrigation periods for each site over each year of the project.

	Site	Temperature (°C)			Relative Humidity (%)			Rainfall (mm)	Production Period (days)
		Min.	Max.	Avg.	Min.	Max.	Avg.		
2000/01	1	1.5	40.1	20.9	8.7	99.4	54.8	35.0	106
	2	1.8	40.4	20.8	8.7	99.3	56.3	40.2	112
	3	0.7	41.5	20.1	8.7	99.4	54.8	30.8	106
	4	1.5	40.1	21.0	8.7	99.4	53.4	35.0	106
	5	-0.8	43.5	21.5	5.4	100.0	56.9	24.6	88
2001/02	1	0.3	37.2	17.0	11.4	99.2	62.1	48.6	128
	2	-0.4	38.5	16.8	11.4	99.2	62.8	60.2	132
	3	-1.8	37.7	16.7	11.4	99.2	62.6	53.6	136
	4	0.0	37.2	17.1	11.4	98.4	61.9	48.4	128
	5	-3.5	38.4	16.8	12.9	100.0	69.3	31.4	120

	Site	Temperature (°C)			Relative Humidity (%)			Rainfall (mm)	Production Period (days)
		Min.	Max.	Avg.	Min.	Max.	Avg.		
2002/03	1	-1.1	41.4	16.8	9.3	99.5	62.4	133.6	182
	2	1.6	41.4	19.0	9.3	97.5	58.6	70.3	113
	3	2.4	41.4	18.9	9.3	97.5	57.9	88.6	114
	4	2.8	41.4	19.2	9.3	97.5	58.3	77.8	105
	5	0.4	44.3	19.2	9.8	100.0	61.3	121.2	129

From Table 2 it is evident that the growing period of lucerne for seed production is relatively constant between crops grown on varying soil types with differing water qualities in any given year. Prevailing weather is relatively consistent across the irrigation area with the length of production apparently driven by subtle variations in temperature from year to year, given that day length is significantly consistent.

### Irrigation times

Tables 3a-e present the irrigation dates and times for each site in each season.

Table 3a:

Site 1	00/01	00/01	01/02	01/02	02/03	02/03
Irrigation	Date	Time	Date	Time	Date	Time
1	11/12/00	13:50-23:30	14/12/01	01:00-10:35	26/09/02	18:30-01:55
2	1/1/01	20:00-08:39	2/1/02	10:40-19:35	1/11/02	02:15-08:35
3	30/1/01	08:30-22:30	2/2/02	17:15-24:00	18/12/02	17:15-**
4			27/2/02	20:10-03:15	29/12/02	17:50-01:15
5					17/1/03	23:15-06:00
6					4/2/03	02:30-08:30
7					9/3/03	05:15-13:30
					18/4/03*	08:35-22:45

\* two bays opened at once hence double area irrigated

\*\* power failure caused excessive and abnormal irrigation length. Average irrigation time was used in assessment.

Table 3b:

Site 1	00/01	00/01	01/02	01/02	02/03	02/03
Irrigation	Date	Time	Date	Time	Date	Time
1	17/12/00	11:20-16:40	30/11/01	15:55-22:50	14/12/02	19:15-23:40
2	11/1/01	21:10-01:40	20/12/01	18:05-23:05	30/12/02	17:15-20:50
3	24/1/01	07:55-12:30	11/1/02	23:12-04:07	13/1/03	03:45-07:45
4	4/2/01	17:00-21:20	1/2/02	09:45-15:20	22/1/03	22:40-06:50
5	19/2/01	15:15-19:35	15/2/02	15:55-21:10	07/2/03	12:15-16:25



Table 3c:

Site 1	00/01	00/01	01/02	01/02	02/03	02/03
Irrigation	Date	Time	Date	Time	Date	Time
1	11/12/00	07:05-10:30	3/12/01	08:20-11:30	02/12/02	08:20-12:00
2	1/1/01	08:14-11:34	20/12/01	07:40-11:35	16/12/02	16:50-20:20
3	13/1/01	14:15-17:35	8/1/02	07:15-11:00	27/12/02	07:30-10:15
4	25/1/01	06:35-09:50	21/1/02	07:05-11:00	8/1/03	08:55-12:20
5	6/2/01	06:40-10:10	5/2/02	08:00-11:55	19/1/03	07:00-10:50
6	18/2/01	07:40-11:50	19/2/02	07:50-12:00	29/1/03	18:30-23:55
7			4/3/02	06:35-10:25	11/2/03	10:20-13:50

Table 3d:

Site 1	00/01	00/01	01/02	01/02	02/03	02/03
Irrigation	Date	Time	Date	Time	Date	Time
1	5/12/00	12:10-14:50	10/12/01	20:15-23:25	12/12/02	15:30-17:50
2	23/12/00	08:25-10:35	30/12/01	20:35-00:10	27/12/02	21:20-00:20
3	8/1/01	12:05-15:00	18/1/02	16:55-20:30	12/01/03	15:40-18:40
4	20/1/01	17:10-20:25	2/2/02	11:10-13:50	26/1/03	21:55-01:15
5	3/2/01	16:10-20:15	20/2/02	18:30-21:05	14/2/03	23:30-02:50

Table 3e:

Site 5	00/01	00/01	01/02	01/02	02/03	02/03*
Irrigation	Date	Application	Date	Application	Date	Application
1	19/12/00- 25/12/00	1.38 ML/ha	6/12/01- 12/12/01	1.14 ML/ha	21/11/02- 25/11/02	2.038 ML/ha
2	14/1/01- 16/1/01	0.63 ML/ha	31/12/01- -3/1/02	0.65 ML/ha 13 mm rain	7/12/02- 13/12/02	
3	31/1/01- 3/2/01	0.63 ML/ha	20/1/02- 23/1/02	0.65 ML/ha 11 mm rain	4/12/02 (rain)	4.8 mm
4	12/2/01 (rain)	4.8 mm	5/2/02- 11/2/02	1.14 ML/ha	30/12/02 (rain)	32 mm
5	16/3/01 (rain)	33.8 mm			11/1/03- 14/1/03	2.33 ML/ha
6					19/1/03- 21/1/03	
7					30/1/03 (rain)	9.4 mm
8					9/2/03- 12/2/03	2.33 ML/ha
9					1/3/03- 4/3/03	
10					16/2/03 (rain)	20.8 mm
11					19/3/03	1.0 ML/ha**

\* Three irrigated hay cuts: 27/12/02 (3.4 t/ha); 1/2/03 (2.5 t/ha); 7/3/03 (1.8 t/ha).

\*\* One irrigation for stock feed.

## 4.4 Water balance results

The data collected from all the instrumentation was analysed in various appropriate calculations used to compute the information required. Many of the calculations are lengthy and cumbersome and it was decided to provide simply the results and not the process of calculation. Tables 4-8 present the water balance results for each site for each year of the project.

Table 4:

### SITE 1

	00/01	01/02	02/03
<b>Average pump flow rate</b>	0.471 ML/hr	0.733 ML/hr	0.666 ML/hr
<b>Volume pumped</b>	10.7 ML/ha	13.913 ML/ha	24.15 ML/ha
<b>Channel drainage (@ peak flow)</b>	0.024 ML/ha	0.166 ML/ha	0.152 ML/ha
<b>Evaporative losses (bay)</b>	0.065 ML/ha	0.028 ML/ha	0.191 ML/ha
<b>Evaporative losses (channel)</b>	0.0008 ML/ha	0.006 ML/ha	0.0223 ML/ha
<b>Volume delivered onto bay</b>	10.675 ML/ha	13.741 ML/ha	23.976 ML/ha
<b>Feeder root depth storage</b>	4.10 ML/ha	4.60 ML/ha	6.72 ML/ha
<b>Drainage</b>	6.599 ML/ha	9.272 ML/ha	17.217 ML/ha
<b>Estimated crop use (raw data)</b>	3.71 ML/ha	3.52 ML/ha	6.08 ML/ha
<b>Residual water stored</b>	0.39 ML/ha	1.08 ML/ha	0.64 ML/ha
<b>ETc (crop use factors)</b>	3.79 ML/ha	3.63 ML/ha	5.08 ML/ha
<b>% pumped water return to aquifer</b>	61.7%	66.6%	71.3%
<b>% pumped water used by crop</b>	34.7%	32.9%	25.2%
<b>% evaporative losses</b>	0.6%	0.3%	0.9%
<b>% pumped water stored in soil throughout crop production period</b>	3.0%	0.2%	2.6%
<b>Irrigations</b>	3	4	8 (all hay)
<b>Clean seed yield (kg/ha)</b>	662	604	N/A

(Rainfall influence is incorporated in the crop water use assessment)

Table 5:

### SITE 2

	00/01	01/02	02/03
<b>Average pump flow rate</b>	0.8 ML/hr	0.839 ML/hr	0.736 ML/hr
<b>Volume pumped</b>	8.022 ML/ha	10.10 ML/ha	7.89 ML/ha
<b>Channel drainage</b>	0.053 ML/ha	0.064 ML/ha	0.053 ML/ha
<b>Evaporative losses (bay)</b>	0.025 ML/ha	0.05 ML/ha	0.06 ML/ha
<b>Evaporative losses (channel)</b>	0.013 ML/ha	0.014 ML/ha	0.015 ML/ha
<b>Volume delivered onto bay</b>	7.956 ML/ha	10.022 ML/ha	7.822 ML/ha
<b>Feeder root depth storage</b>	4.00 ML/ha	4.00 ML/ha	4.00 ML/ha
<b>Drainage</b>	3.984 ML/ha	6.036 ML/ha	3.815 ML/ha
<b>Estimated crop use (raw data)</b>	3.69 ML/ha	3.62 ML/ha	3.60 ML/ha
<b>Residual water stored</b>	0.31 ML/ha	0.38 ML/ha	0.40 ML/ha
<b>ETc (crop use factors)</b>	3.65 ML/ha	3.68 ML/ha	3.76 ML/ha
<b>% pumped water return to aquifer</b>	49.7%	59.8%	48.4%
<b>% pumped water used by crop</b>	46.0%	35.8%	45.6%
<b>% evaporative losses</b>	0.5%	0.6%	1.0%
<b>% pumped water stored in soil throughout crop production period</b>	3.8%	3.8%	5.0%
<b>Irrigations</b>	5	5	5
<b>Clean seed yield (kg/ha)</b>	440	410	365 (seedling)

(Rainfall influence is incorporated in the crop water use assessment)

02/03 was a different field site in an adjacent seed crop. This crop was furrow irrigated. Using the same pump and channel.

Table 6:  
**SITE 3**

	<b>00/01</b>	<b>01/02</b>	<b>02/03</b>
<b>Average pump flow rate</b>	0.766 ML/hr	0.737 ML/hr	0.590 ML/hr
<b>Volume pumped</b>	6.965 ML/ha	8.504 ML/ha	7.348 ML/ha
<b>Channel drainage</b>	0.089 ML/ha	0.097 ML/ha	0.095 ML/ha
<b>Evaporative losses (bay)</b>	0.015 ML/ha	0.015 ML/ha	0.06 ML/ha
<b>Evaporative losses (channel)</b>	0.003 ML/ha	0.002 ML/ha	0.007 ML/ha
<b>Volume delivered onto bay</b>	6.873 ML/ha	8.405 ML/ha	7.246 ML/ha
<b>Feeder root depth storage</b>	4.80 ML/ha	5.60 ML/ha	5.60 ML/ha
<b>Drainage</b>	2.144 ML/ha	2.902 ML/ha	1.741 ML/ha
<b>Estimated crop use (raw data)</b>	4.09 ML/ha	4.06 ML/ha	3.98 ML/ha
<b>Residual water stored</b>	0.71 ML/ha	1.54 ML/ha	1.62 ML/ha
<b>ETc (crop use factors)</b>	3.97 ML/ha	3.99 ML/ha	4.04 ML/ha
<b>% pumped water return to aquifer</b>	30.8%	34.1%	23.7%
<b>% pumped water used by crop</b>	58.7%	47.8%	54.2%
<b>% evaporative losses</b>	0.3%	0.2%	0.9%
<b>% pumped water stored in soil throughout crop production period</b>	10.2%	17.9%	21.2%
<b>Irrigations</b>	6	7	7
<b>Clean seed yield (kg/ha)</b>	680	714	550

(Rainfall influence is incorporated in the crop water use assessment)

Table 7:  
**SITE 4**

	<b>00/01</b>	<b>01/02</b>	<b>02/03</b>
<b>Average pump flow rate</b>	0.406 ML/hr	0.385 ML/hr	0.479 ML/hr
<b>Volume pumped</b>	9.061 ML/ha	9.497 ML/ha	10.855 ML/ha
<b>Channel drainage</b>	0.084 ML/ha	0.091 ML/ha	0.084 ML/ha
<b>Evaporative losses (bay)</b>	0.02 ML/ha	1.0 x 10 <sup>-4</sup> ML/ha	0.051 ML/ha
<b>Evaporative losses (channel)</b>	0.013 ML/ha	0.003 ML/ha	0.016 ML/ha
<b>Volume delivered onto bay</b>	8.964 ML/ha	9.403 ML/ha	10.755 ML/ha
<b>Feeder root depth storage</b>	4.25 ML/ha	4.25 ML/ha	4.25 ML/ha
<b>Drainage</b>	4.778 ML/ha	5.244 ML/ha	6.522 ML/ha
<b>Estimated crop use (raw data)</b>	3.85 ML/ha	3.71 ML/ha	3.80 ML/ha
<b>Residual water stored</b>	0.40 ML/ha	0.54 ML/ha	0.45 ML/ha
<b>ETc (crop use factors)</b>	3.85 ML/ha	3.71 ML/ha	3.59 ML/ha
<b>% pumped water return to aquifer</b>	52.7%	55.2%	60.1%
<b>% pumped water used by crop</b>	42.5%	39.1%	35.0%
<b>% evaporative losses</b>	0.4%	3.1 x 10 <sup>-4</sup> %	0.6%
<b>% pumped water stored in soil throughout crop production period</b>	4.4%	5.699%	4.3%
<b>Irrigations</b>	5	5	5
<b>Clean seed yield (kg/ha)</b>	608	621	556

(Rainfall influence is incorporated in the crop water use assessment)

Table 8:  
**SITE 5**

	<b>00/01<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>01/02<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>02/03<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>Average pump flow rate</b>	0.386 ML/hr	0.386 ML/hr	0.182 ML/hr
<b>Volume pumped</b>	2.70 ML/ha	3.75 ML/ha	6.698 ML/ha
<b>Rain</b>	0.246 ML/ha	0.314 ML/ha	1.21 ML/ha
<b>Evaporative losses</b>	0.162 ML/ha	0.193 ML/ha	0.139 ML/ha
<b>Volume delivered</b>	2.786 ML/ha	3.871 ML/ha	6.559 ML/ha
<b>Feeder root depth storage</b>	3.00 ML/ha	3.90 ML/ha	4.20 ML/ha
<b>Drainage</b>	0.0 ML/ha	0.0 ML/ha	2.35 ML/ha
<b>Estimated crop use (raw data)</b>	3.29 ML/ha	3.56 ML/ha	3.50 ML/ha
<b>Residual water stored</b>	0.00 ML/ha	0.311 ML/ha	0.70 ML/ha
<b>Etc (crop use factors)</b>	3.29ML/ha	3.41ML/ha	3.49 ML/ha
<b>% delivered water return to aquifer</b>	undetectable	undetectable	35.1%
<b>% delivered water used by crop</b>	100.0%	92.0%	52.3%
<b>% evaporative losses</b>	5.5%	5.1%	2.1%
<b>% delivered water stored in soil throughout crop production period</b>	0.0%	8.0%	10.5%
<b>Irrigations</b>	3	4	6
<b>Clean seed yield (kg/ha)</b>	450	550	N/A

**a:** centre pivot rated as 95% efficient with no run off. **b:** centre pivot rated as 87% efficient with no run off.

00/01 & 00/02 used a new permanent centre pivot dedicated to the irrigated seed crop and irrigation was applied to supply crop needs in consideration of rainfall. Rainfall is included in the volume applied.

02/03 was a shared old centre pivot with another lucerne hay crop and irrigation was applied irrespective of rainfall but based on logistics. Rainfall is not included in the volume applied.

The water balance results indicate that under typical prevailing weather during the irrigation season evaporative losses in flood irrigation are minimal and while they were significantly greater under the centre pivot system, they were still comparatively minor compared to crop water use and drainage.

The detailed, time consuming and more costly assessment of crop water use from the soil moisture data compared closely with the estimated data using the modified Penman Monteith equation together with the crop factors specified for varying stages of lucerne seed production. The need for volumetric analysis of soil moisture holding capacity to calibrate the soil moisture sensors is a complex process made more onerous in the stony soil types in the research area. Of more importance is the development of accurate crop factors for manipulation of the ET data. This permits greater scope for the application of the water balance calculation as it eradicates the volumetric analysis. In the context of this relative type of research, increased site evaluation is more value than slightly more accuracy over reduced sites. Consequently in future research, use of estimated crop water use using the crop factors would be adequate.

## 5. Implications for irrigators

The results highlight the impacts of some of the basic management processes used in irrigation of lucerne seed crops. Seed yields were generally consistent with the 02/03 season yields being reduced due to seasonal influences. For seed production crops the water use (using specific lucerne seed production crop use factors) across the district, on varying soil types and with varying water salinity were very similar, ranging from 3.29 – 4.09 ML/ha. Water use was consistent from season to season for each seed crop but the percentage of water used by the crop varied in relation to the volume pumped. The volume pumped per season, whilst being a function of the number of total irrigations, also varies significantly irrespective of whether the numbers of irrigations from year to year vary or not. This has an immediate impact on the efficiency of the irrigation system, where efficiency can be expressed as the percentage of pumped water actually used by the crop. For example in site 4 in 00/01, 42.5% of the pumped water was used by the crop and in 02/03, 35% was used by the crop yet the total number of irrigations were the same and the total crop production period varied by only one day. The factors of significance impacting on volume pumped was the time taken to irrigate the field and the pump flow rate. In general the flow rate varied due to the volume of water in the aquifer, type of pump used (i.e. centrifugal or turbine) and, in the case of diesel motor driven pumps, the motor revolutions/minute. For site 4 in 02/03 the flow rate was 17% higher than 00/01 yet the average time taken to irrigate the bay differed only by one minute. Consequently 17% more water was applied but did not increase the rate of irrigation (i.e. reduce irrigation time/ha) only increasing the drainage component as the active root zone could not store the extra water applied per irrigation. The other factor of interest is that either the grower did not cease irrigating the bay early enough or, and more likely, the 17% extra water did not increase the head of pressure to increase the rate of flow down the bay in excess of the infiltration rate through the soil before the water reached the bay end. An implication of this result is that increasing the flow rate does not necessarily result in reduced irrigation time and improved irrigation efficiency. This example is further highlighted at site 2 between seasons 00/01 and 01/02 and seasons 01/02 and 02/03. In addition at site 1 in 00/01 there was only one pump available and three irrigations were applied resulting in crop water use of 34.7% of water pumped. In 01/02 an additional pump was added to the system which reduced irrigation time by 2.8 hours/ha by increasing the volume applied by 29%. However these changes did not improve the percentage of pumped water used by the crop as one more irrigation was applied, more water was drained through the feeder root zone and more water loss occurred through the additional irrigation channel.

Consequently, an implication of the research for the irrigators is that increasing flow rates does not necessarily equate to improved irrigation efficiency. Soil type, bay size and slope have significant bearing on the percentage of pumped water used by the crop. In addition, such as with site 2, where from season 00/01 to 01/02 pump flow rate increased by 5.0% yet average irrigation time increased by approximately 0.5 hour/ha and the percentage of pumped water used by the crop reduced by 10%, the main factor was the timing of irrigation changes – i.e. the irrigation bays were over irrigated. Such results indicate that irrigation practice has an immediate impact on irrigation efficiency.

The percentage of pumped water stored in the soil throughout the crop production period is a cumulative measurement of the soil water quantity within the feeder root zone (being part of the estimated readily available water quantity) remaining in the active root zone immediately prior to each irrigation. In addition, it includes the estimation of soil moisture remaining in the active root zone after the final irrigation and at the time of harvest. In sites 1,2 and 4 when a final irrigation was applied 8 weeks before harvest the crop used a significant proportion of the stored water and a residual less than 10% is not enough for any substantial regrowth after harvest. In site 3 when the final irrigation was applied 6-7 weeks before harvest the stored water percentage increased above 10% and fresh lucerne regrowth is evident after harvest. The number of flood irrigations for seed production is static from one season to the next. An increase in irrigations is associated with a cooler season rather than a hotter season as the crop takes longer to mature and there is uncertainty as to whether there will be enough

moisture in the soil for optimum seed fill. In hotter seasons the crops mature quickly and the extra irrigation is often unwarranted. When an extra final irrigation is applied the residual water storage tends to increase. Consequently in site 3 there exists an opportunity for the irrigator to slightly increase the time between irrigations 5 and 6 which may permit the omission of irrigation 7 and hence improve efficiency. Provided the crop is not unduly water stressed the efficiency of an irrigation system and the reduction in drainage can be improved by strategic timing of irrigation to reduce the stored content prior to irrigation thereby maximising each irrigation's impact on replenishing the root zone rather than having increased drainage.

Channel drainage is directly related to the material used for channel construction, with leaking irrigation gates contributing in a minor way to water loss. Channels constructed of marly rubble seal well in comparison to channels made with stony rubble and inadequate sealing of the channel floor. Irrigating 50 hectares of lucerne seed using a marly rubble channel such as site 2 would lose approximately 3.0 ML through channel drainage whereas site 1 with stony rubble material forming a channel would lose 8.3 ML through channel drainage. Evaporative losses are very small relative to channel seepage losses and improvements in irrigation efficiency could be gained by alterations to the delivery channel, specifically the associated drainage component.

In 00/01 and 01/02 site 5 was a fixed centre pivot seed crop that could be irrigated as the crop required. Irrigation was applied to the feeder root depth with negligible quantities passing below this level. Irrigations were often at night or in calmer daytime weather so as to improve application efficiency by reducing evaporative losses. In 00/01 the crop was under irrigated and was forced into a water deficit after the final irrigation. Consequently in the water balance calculation all of the pumped water (excepting evaporation losses) was used by the crop with no storage. The irrigation management was refined in 01/02. The increased seed yield in 01/02 was directly influenced by more applied irrigation compared to 00/01. The pivot site enabled a refined assessment of crop water use as delivery of specific quantities of irrigation to the crop supplied the lucerne seed crop requirement thereby minimising drainage and storage. These results confirm the reliability of crop water use estimates, using weather data and crop coefficients, as well as the drainage components in the flood irrigated research sites.

Site 5 was shifted in 02/03 to an older centre pivot shared between two irrigated paddocks – a situation common in irrigated pivot production. Both pivots were lucerne hay crops. Consequently the hay crop was irrigated before and after hay cuts and when the pivot was not in use by the other crop. This was, on occasions, in periods of rainfall or cooler weather when the hay crop did not necessarily require irrigation due to available soil moisture in the feeder root zone. It is evident that in this situation the efficiency of the pivot irrigation system was significantly less than the seed crop of preceding seasons. However the crop used more than 50% of the applied irrigation. It is reasonable to assume that the water use efficiency of seed crops irrigated in a shared pivot system would also be significantly different from the fixed pivot data and are more likely to be similar to the hay crop data – especially as the water use figures are comparable. Irrigators involved with these systems could improve efficiency by having a sufficient time difference between the hay or seed crops to minimize irrigating when not required by the crop.

In site 1 the hay crop in 02/03 used nearly 73% more water than the seed crop on the same paddock in the preceding season, and required 73% more water to be pumped. However the percentage used by the crop or stored in the feeder root zone differed only by 7.1%. Consequently, in this case, the water use efficiency was not greatly different between the seed and hay crops.

The water balance research provides an understanding of the baseline data from which improvements in irrigation efficiency can be derived. The results are of considerable benefit to the irrigator in the licence conversion process, but beyond this the greater strength is in a system of measuring the water balance and any improvements to the efficiency of irrigation delivery and crop water use.

## 6. Implications for policy makers

The research sites represent a significant proportion of the irrigated lucerne seed production area which the irrigation licence conversion process effects and the research has determined that for the flood irrigated sites a delivery component, i.e. the percentage of water pumped that is lost in the process of delivering water to the crop, is very small. For example in site 2 in the 02/03 season the delivery component was 0.9% of the volume pumped. Additionally the losses attributed to evaporation are also very small and at the same site the losses in 02/03 were 1.0%. Consequently the significant majority of water pumped is used by the crop, stored in the root zone for use after harvest or drained at an undetermined rate back to the aquifer.

In the conversion of the licence system it could be considered that the volume granted per hectare of irrigation currently irrigated for lucerne seed production be 120 – 150% the root depth storage. Alternatively, and possibly easier to calculate, the volume granted could be 200% of the ETc. For example, if it is accepted that a lucerne seed crop uses 4.0 ML/ha, the licence should be 12.00 ML/ha. From this quantity, and on the basis of the research over three consecutive seasons, 10 of the 11 flood irrigated seed crops would be unaffected by the licence conversion. This would successfully have the volumetric conversion process not significantly influence current irrigation operations, production base, economic status of the irrigated lucerne seed production industry and regional economic structure.

Desmier and Schrale (1988) based the current irrigation equivalent (I.E) licence system on estimated lucerne seed crop water use (ETc) requirements that exceed those calculated in this research. Their estimate of lucerne seed crop water use for the months of December to March exceeded 5.0 ML/ha whereas the research calculates water use in the range of 3.5-4.0 ML/ha. One of the assumptions of the IE scheme is that the root zone of lucerne was 500 mm deep and plant available moisture in this zone ranged from 35-70 mm depending on soil type. This research has determined the active root zone available moisture to vary between 80-120 mm and that root zone depth varies from 400-1200 mm depending on the soil type. The research's findings impact on the technical accuracy of the IE scheme i.e. lucerne does not use as much water as the IE scheme estimates hence the assigned equivalent should be higher. A key factor in the inaccuracy of the IE scheme are the crop coefficients used in the conversion of ET<sub>o</sub> to ET<sub>c</sub>. The research has fine tuned the variation of the crop coefficients through the seed crop production phase. A correction of the IE schemes inaccuracy could result in an increased irrigated lucerne area. However this is not necessarily advocated due to declining ground water levels and water quality in some areas. The impacts of irrigation on the unconfined aquifer and its quality are evident and the inaccuracy of the IE scheme in respect to lucerne seed production has probably had a positive effect on aquifer sustainability.

The IE scheme assessed lucerne seed and the reference crop across an entire calendar year in determining the ETc and hence the IE conversion. This may have been appropriate in 1988 when the scheme was introduced but it appears to have inaccuracies. It is more appropriate to focus on the irrigated period for the calculations given that under current practices in 2004, the management and production of a lucerne seed crop pasture (potential seed crop) in the months of May-November/December (or when lucerne seed crops are initially irrigated) is totally rain fed. It appears more appropriate to focus on the lucerne crop (and reference crop) water use and irrigation requirements for production through the irrigated period and make the distinction between rain and irrigation contribution. As mentioned earlier the estimation of lucerne seed crop water use by the IE scheme is inaccurate and it appears appropriate to use research such as utilised in this project to determine the volumes required to permit continuance of the current irrigation practices rather than attempt to convert from the existing scheme per se.

The licence conversion process should not, unless an existing irrigation system is very inefficient, reduce the current volumes pumped and area irrigated for lucerne seed production in the region. The

process of modifying licence volumes in the context of aquifer management e.g. groundwater salinity management, should be a separate process based on different and more specific research.



## 7. Recommendations

On the basis of the research results the following recommendations and comments are made to the lucerne irrigators of the upper south east of South Australia, the Australian lucerne seed Industry, Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation (RIRDC), the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (DWLBC) and the South East Catchment Water Management Board (SECWMB).

- 1) Proceed with the Volumetric Conversion Project throughout the upper and lower south east of South Australia utilising this research and its methodologies.
- 2) The research is critical in a fair conversion of licences from the current IE system to a quantified water volume (volumetric) licence. The research is indicative of the irrigated lucerne seed production region but there are likely to be those whose irrigation systems will be better or worse than the efficiencies recorded. The aim of the licence changing process is to fairly convert based on quantified evidence from across the irrigation region.
- 3) The conversion process is not an opportunity to reduce or increase water licence allocations, but it is a starting point for obtaining the baseline understanding of irrigation efficiency. The water balance research determines what happens to pumped irrigation water and, in turn, defines areas where water use efficiency can be improved.
- 4) Any form of conversion from the existing scheme, for the benefit of the ground water system, would need to be done from its current form and not a revised and more technically accurate form. The conversion could be as simple as: 1 reference crop unit = 1.2 lucerne seed units = 1 ha of irrigated lucerne seed = 12.00 ML/ha (or a similar figure)
- 5) Irrigators must use the results of the research and investigate their own irrigation systems to understand their water balance and where improvements in efficiency can be made. This will be paramount once licences become volumetric and there is defined water quantities available for irrigation as well as the option to trade water in excess of their own crop's requirements.
- 6) To encourage efficiency improvements by irrigators coupled with any necessary reductions in licenced volumes on the basis of quantified research, an irrigators specific reductions could be placed in trust and can be redeemed for own use (e.g. trading/ farm use) if they meet (in a forecast time) milestone efficiency improvements such as reduced pumped volumes per irrigated area.
- 7) Dedicated research must take place in the area of quantifying the impact of the water balance system on water quality and hence the sustainability of the resource. Such work has commenced and is critical if significant changes to water allocations are to be required.
- 8) Research should be conducted into quantifying how much pumped irrigation water is pumped again in the same irrigation season, and the impact this has on the water quality. In addition there are licensing issues if a percentage of the water is pumped on more than one occasion. This is all part of a fair and sustainable licensing system.
- 9) This type of research should be well promoted to the irrigation communities of Australia.

## 8. Communications strategy

The completed research report will be disseminated to DWLBC, SECWMB, Hundred of Stirling Water Resources Group, Tintinara-Coonalpyn Irrigators and the South East Natural Resources Consultative Committee (SENRCC).

The irrigators will have the research findings disseminated via local press/media as well as via the Volumetric Conversion Project community consultation process. Information will also be released at any appropriate field day and conferences.

## 9. References

*Akbar, S. and Khan, S. (2003):* Methodologies for quantifying on-farm channel and drain interactions with regional groundwater dynamics. To be published.

*Desmier, R.E. and Schrale G. (1988):* Estimations of water requirements for irrigated crops in the Tatiara Proclaimed Region. Dept. of Ag. SA. Tech. Rep. No. 127.