

Evaluating irrigators responses to declining groundwater supplies: a case study

Graham A. Harris

Department of Agricultural & Resource Economics
University of New England

1996

Declaration

I certify that the substance of this dissertation has not already been submitted for any degree and is not currently submitted for any other degree.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, any help received in preparing this dissertation, and all sources used, have been acknowledged.

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of the author.

Abstract

This study examines the profitability of adopting subsurface drip irrigation and alternative activities such as horticultural crops and redclaw crayfish production by a case study irrigation farm experiencing declining groundwater supplies.

A multi-period linear programming model was developed to assess the profitability of these approaches. The model demonstrated that the use of subsurface drip irrigation and annual horticultural crops was a profitable response for the case study farm. It was also shown that a lucerne hay production activity was an integral part of the optimal farm plan across the range of groundwater supply situations examined. This is despite the high consumptive use of irrigation water by this activity.

This study provides an economic analysis of subsurface drip irrigation and redclaw crayfish production - both recent developments in Australian agriculture. In addition, economic analysis of a range of traditional and alternative field and horticultural crops for this location is provided.

Contents

Declaration	ii
Abstract	iii
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	x
Acknowledgements	xi
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Research problem	1
1.3 Study Objectives	3
1.4 Hypotheses	4
1.5 Study outline	5
2. Description of the study area	6
2.1 The Callide Valley	6
2.2 Resources	6
2.2.1 Climate	6
2.2.2 Water	8
2.2.3 Soils	9
2.3 Agricultural Development	9
2.4 Irrigation Industry	10
2.4.1 Historical	10
2.4.2 The Groundwater Resource	12
2.4.2.1 Supply	12
2.4.2.2 Water Quality	13
2.4.3 Management of Groundwater Resource	15
2.4.3.1 Resource Assessment	16
2.4.3.2 Structural Works	16
2.4.3.3 Administrative controls	18
2.4.3.4 Landholder actions	19
2.4.4 Irrigated agricultural systems	19
3. Farm Planning - Theory and Practice	23
3.1 Introduction	23
3.2 Farm planning	23
3.3 Farm management economics	24
3.4 Farm planning models	29
3.4.1 Simulation models	30
3.4.2 Budgeting models	31

3.4.3 Linear Programming	32
3.5 Long term planning	35
3.5.1 Development planning	35
3.5.2 Multiperiod Linear Programming	36
3.6 The application of Linear Programming models	39
4. Methodology	43
4.1 Introduction	43
4.2 Case study farm business	44
4.2.1 Land	44
4.2.2 Water and irrigation	44
4.2.3 Activity pattern	44
4.2.4 Labour	45
4.2.5 Overhead costs	45
4.2.6 Capital	45
4.3 Data sources	46
4.3.1 Crops	46
4.3.2 SDI	46
4.3.3 Redclaw	46
4.4 Data analysis	47
4.4.1 Resource use	47
4.4.2 Development economics	48
4.4.2.1 Capital Investment	48
4.4.2.2 SDI	48
4.4.2.3 Table Grapes	49
4.4.2.4 Redclaw	49
4.4.3 Activity analysis	50
4.4.3.1 Activity options	50
4.4.3.2 Assumptions	51
4.4.3.3 Gross margins	54
4.5 Summary	61
5. Static LP Model	63
5.1 Introduction	63
5.2 Specification	63
5.2.1 The objective function	63
5.2.2 Activities	64
5.2.3 Constraints	64
5.2.4 The LP Matrix	68
5.3 Implementation	69
5.4 Solution	69
5.4.1 Initial Optimal Plan	69
5.4.2 Shadow prices	71
5.5 Sensitivity analysis	73
5.5.1 Announced Water Allocation	73
5.5.2 Maximum lucerne area	76

5.5.3 Maximum annual horticultural area	78
5.5.4 Casual labour	80
5.6 Summary	82
6. MLP Model	84
6.1 Introduction	84
6.2 Model Specification	84
6.2.1 The objective function	84
6.2.2 Activities	85
6.2.3 Constraints	88
6.2.4 The LP Matrix	91
6.3 Solution	91
6.4 Sensitivity analysis	95
6.4.1 Announced Water Allocation	95
6.4.2 Availability of borrowed capital	98
6.4.3 Starting capital	100
6.4.4 Casual labour	103
6.5 Summary	105
7. Discussion	107
7.1 Introduction	107
7.2 Static optimal farm plan	107
7.2.1 Activity mix	107
7.2.2 Announced water allocations	108
7.2.3 Activity level constraints	111
7.2.3.1 Maximum lucerne area	111
7.2.3.2 Maximum annual horticultural area	112
7.2.3.3 Casual labour	113
7.3 MLP optimal farm plan	113
7.3.1 Activity mix and investment decisions	113
7.3.2 Announced water allocations	114
7.3.3 Capital considerations	115
7.3.4 Casual labour availability	116
7.4 Adoption of drip irrigation technology	117
7.5 Summary	119
8. Summary and Conclusions	120
8.1 Introduction	120
8.2 Hypotheses	120
8.2.1 Hypothesis 1	120
8.2.2 Hypothesis 2	120
8.2.3 Hypothesis 3	121
8.2.4 Hypothesis 4	122
8.3 Major findings	122
8.4 Study limitations	123

8.5 Future research	124
8.6 Conclusions	125
Appendix 1	126
Appendix 2	127
Appendix 3	128
Appendix 4	129
Appendix 5	130
Appendix 6	131
Appendix 7	132
Appendix 8	133
Appendix 9	135
Appendix 10	137
Appendix 11	138
Appendix 12	145
References	148

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Announced allocations for Callide Valley groundwater sections 1990-91 to 1996-97	20
Table 2.2: Management strategies to improve irrigation efficiency	21
Table 3.1: The linear programming tableau	33
Table 4.1: Overhead costs for case study farm	45
Table 4.2: Equipment requirements and cost for alternative activities	48
Table 4.3: Existing and potential activities for case study farm business	51
Table 4.4: Yield assumptions used in drawing up activity gross margins	52
Table 4.5: Price assumptions used in drawing up activity gross margins	53
Table 4.6: Water use (ML/ha) assumptions used in drawing up activity gross margins	54
Table 4.7: Traditional field crop activity gross margin comparison	55
Table 4.8: SDI field crop activity gross margin comparison	56
Table 4.9: Traditional horticultural crop activity gross margin comparison	58
Table 4.10: SDI horticultural crop activity gross margin comparison	59
Table 4.11: Cattle activity gross margins	60
Table 4.12: Redclaw crayfish activity gross margins	61
Table 5.1: Activity list for LP mode	65
Table 5.2: Constraint list for LP model	67
Table 5.3: Comparison of optimal farm plans pre-intensification and post-intensification	70
Table 5.4: Shadow prices for selected constraints within the initial optimal farm plan	72
Table 5.5: The impact of changes in the announced water allocation upon the optimal farm plan	74
Table 5.6: The impact of changes in the announced water allocation upon the optimal farm plan with all activities possible and no limit on lucerne	77
Table 5.7: The impact on the optimal farm plan of relaxing the constraint on the maximum area of annual horticultural crops	79
Table 5.8: The impact on the optimal farm plan of relaxing the hired labour constraint	81
Table 6.1: Activity list for MLP model	86

Table 6.2: Details of investment activities incorporated in the MLP	87
Table 6.3: Constraint list for MLP model	89
Table 6.4: The original optimal farm plan	93
Table 6.5: The impact of changes in the announced water allocation upon the the optimal farm plan	97
Table 6.6: The impact of changes in the limit on borrowing in Year 1 upon the optimal farm plan	99
Table 6.7: The impact of changes in available investment capital in Year 1 upon the optimal farm plan	101
Table 6.8: The impact of changes in the availability of casual labour upon the optimal farm plan	104
Table 7.1 Elasticities of selected variables with respect to the water resource ^a	114

List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Five year moving average annual rainfall for Biloela	7
Figure 2.2: Monthly temperature data for Biloela	7
Figure 2.3: Variability in monthly Class A Pan evaporation for Biloela	8
Figure 2.4: Irrigated cropping areas in the Callide Valley 1946-47 to 1994-95	11
Figure 2.5: Distribution of nominal allocations within the Callide Valley	12
Figure 2.6: Water levels for Bore 13030084 (Section 10) for 1963-64 to 1994-95	14
Figure 2.7: Water levels for Bore 13030089 (Section 8) for 1963-64 to 1995-96	14
Figure 3.1: Production constraints for pumpkin and tomato production	27
Figure 3.2: The production possibility boundary	28
Figure 3.3: Maximising total gross margin	29
Figure 6.1: Diagrammatic layout of overall model	92
Figure 6.2: The impact of differing water availability pre- and post- intensification upon cumulative operating profit	96
Figure 6.3: The impact of changes in the borrowing limit upon cumulative operating profit	100
Figure 6.4: The impact of initial investment capital upon cumulative operating profit	102
Figure 7.1: Comparison of water shadow prices for pre- and post-intensification (bars), and existing groundwater charges (lines)	109
Figure 7.2: The impact of removing the lucerne area restriction upon the lucerne area (bars) and profitability (lines) of the pre- and post-intensification optimal farm plan, as affected by water	112

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the following people for their assistance in the conduct of this research:

- Trevor and Lyn Stringer, 'Vorelle', Biloela who own and operate the farming business which is the subject of this study. Their innovation in dealing with the declining groundwater supplies of the Callide Valley and willing assistance during model development was invaluable.
- Paul and Leah Van Itallie, Central Queensland Crayfish, Biloela who gave freely of their time and knowledge about the fledgling redclaw crayfish industry.
- Cameron Milne, Rockhampton who provided cost detail for his recent redclaw crayfish development.
- Steve Pratt and Don Milne, Agricultural Requirements, Biloela who provided detail on irrigation systems and their associated costs.
- Rob Badman, Primac, Biloela who provided the cost detail for inputs associated with the alternative activities investigated in this study.
- Ian Baker and Ashley Bleakley, Department of Natural Resources (formerly the Queensland Water Resources Commission) for detail on the management of the groundwater resource in the Callide Valley.

I wish to thank my supervisor Dr Oscar Cacho for his support and suggestions during the course of the study and the preparation of this dissertation. His assistance in model development is gratefully acknowledged.

The assistance of my employer, the Department of Primary Industries and its team of dedicated staff, is duly acknowledged and appreciated.

Finally, it would not have been possible to undertake the Master of Economics degree, and this dissertation, without the support and understanding of my immediate family - my wife Julie, and children Nathaniel, Jessica and Luke (our special boy), and my father-in-law, Arthur.