

# **Property name: Sharkey**

**OCTOBER 2020** 



### 112 Wright Street, East Devonport, Tasmania 7310

### Phone: 1300 746 466

### Email: admin@pinionadvisory.com

### www.pinionadvisory.com

Report author:	Jason Lynch & Sarah Jones

An appropriate citation for this report Pinion Advisory, 2020. WIN Land capability assessment: Sharkey, Western Water. Hobart, TAS

Document status:

is:

Version 1.0

Date	Status /Issue number	Reviewed by	Authorised by	Transmission method
47/0/20	DDAFT ( O			<b>F</b> 11 <b>1 1 1</b>
17/9/20	DRAFT 1.0	JL	21	Email to client
21/10/20	Version 1.0	JL	SJ	Email to client

This report has been prepared in accordance with the scope of services described in the contract or agreement between Pinion Advisory and the Client. Any findings, conclusions or recommendations only apply to the aforementioned circumstances and no greater reliance should be assumed or drawn by the Client. Furthermore, the report has been prepared solely for use by the Client and Pinion Advisory accepts no responsibility for its use by other parties.

# **Contents**

1	Ba	ackground	5
	1.1	Scope of LCA	6
2	La	nd use review	7
3	La	ind capability assessment	8
	3.1	Soil and landscape features	9
	3.2	Outcome of land capability assessment	10
4	Irr	rigation water balance	12
	4.1	Rainfall and evaporation	12
5	Irr	rigation concept design and demand	13
	5.1	Buffer zones and offsite risk management	14
6	Su	urface water risk management	16
7	Nu	utrient leaching and groundwater risk management	17
	7.1	Nutrient management	17
	7.2	Groundwater	18
8	7.2 So	Groundwater bil salinity and sodicity risk management	18 19
8	7.2 So 8.1	Groundwater bil salinity and sodicity risk management Salinity risk assessment	18 19 19
8	7.2 Sc 8.1 8.2	Groundwater bil salinity and sodicity risk management Salinity risk assessment Sodicity risk assessment	18 19 19 20
8	7.2 So 8.1 8.2 8.3	Groundwater bil salinity and sodicity risk management Salinity risk assessment Sodicity risk assessment Soil monitoring	18 19 19 20 20
8	7.2 So 8.1 8.2 8.3 Co	Groundwater bil salinity and sodicity risk management Salinity risk assessment Sodicity risk assessment Soil monitoring Donclusions and recommendations	18 19 20 20 21
8 9 1(	7.2 So 8.1 8.2 8.3 Co	Groundwater bil salinity and sodicity risk management Salinity risk assessment Sodicity risk assessment Soil monitoring Disconclusions and recommendations References	18 19 20 20 21 21 22
8 9 1( 1:	7.2 So 8.1 8.2 8.3 Co	Groundwater bil salinity and sodicity risk management Salinity risk assessment Sodicity risk assessment Soil monitoring Donclusions and recommendations References Appendices	18 19 20 20 21 21 22 23
8 9 1( 1:	7.2 So 8.1 8.2 8.3 Co D L Appe	Groundwater bil salinity and sodicity risk management Salinity risk assessment Sodicity risk assessment Soil monitoring Donclusions and recommendations References Appendices endix A: Irrigation concept design map	18 19 20 20 21 21 22 23
8 9 1( 1:	7.2 So 8.1 8.2 8.3 Co L Appe	Groundwater Dil salinity and sodicity risk management Salinity risk assessment Sodicity risk assessment Soil monitoring Dinclusions and recommendations References Appendices endix A: Irrigation concept design map endix B: Soil map with groundwater bore identification	18 19 20 21 21 22 23 23 25
8 9 10 1:	7.2 So 8.1 8.2 8.3 Co L Appe Appe	Groundwater bil salinity and sodicity risk management Salinity risk assessment Sodicity risk assessment Soil monitoring Donclusions and recommendations References Appendices endix A: Irrigation concept design map endix A: Irrigation concept design map endix B: Soil map with groundwater bore identification endix C: Soil profile assessment	18 19 20 21 21 23 23 25 27
8 9 1( 1:	7.2 So 8.1 8.2 8.3 Co L Appe Appe	Groundwater bil salinity and sodicity risk management Salinity risk assessment Sodicity risk assessment Soil monitoring Donclusions and recommendations References Appendices endix A: Irrigation concept design map endix A: Irrigation concept design map endix B: Soil map with groundwater bore identification endix C: Soil profile assessment endix D: Land capability score	18 19 20 21 21 23 23 25 27 29



### **Table index**

Table 1 WIN stage 1 property details	6
Table 2 Soil pit location	8
Table 3 Land capability assessment description	9
Table 4 Annual rainfall, evaporation and evapotranspiration statistics	12
Table 5 Median rainfall, evaporation and evapotranspiration by month	12
Table 6 Lucerne and winter wheat crop coefficients	13
Table 7 Total annual irrigation requirements for lucerne and winter wheat	13
Table 8 Irrigation areas and estimated water demand (Lucerne or wheat) under var	ious climate
scenarios	13
Table 9 Recycled water irrigation buffer requirements	14
Table 10 Recycled water nutrient budget summary	17
Table 11 Salinity tolerances of lucerne and wheat	19
Table 12: Sharkey test pit soil profile	27
Table 13 Sharkey test pit soil nutrient status	28
Table 14 LCA scoring method	29
Table 15 Soil and landscape suitability score for the Sharkey property	29
Table 16 Bore identification on and nearby to the Sharkey recycled irrigation development	nt site30



# **1** Background

Western Water has developed the Western Irrigation Network (WIN) project to meet environmental compliance obligations for managing forecast recycled water volumed from the Bacchus Marsh, Sunbury and Melton recycled water plans until 2050.

The WIN project will connect the Bacchus Marsh, Melton and Sunbury recycled water plants to a new irrigation district in the Parwan-Balliang region to the west of Melbourne (Figure 1). The project involves construction of permanent infrastructure to supply class C recycled water to up to 4500ha of high quality irrigable land.

The Balliang East district is a traditional dryland cropping and pastoral production area which typically annually receives less than 500mm of rainfall. Agricultural productivity of the district is highly constrained due to the prevailing low rainfall conditions. The WIN irrigation development offers the opportunity for landowners to access a high reliability irrigation supply to support the production of various crops and pasture and hence underpin the ongoing viability of agricultural production systems in the district.





Three foundation properties are central to the initial development of the WIN project (Table 1). Additional connections will be considered by Western Water as the project progresses.



#### Table 1 WIN stage 1 property details

Property name	Address	Proposed irrigation area (ha)	Recycled water allocation ML/annum*
Griffiths	300 Agars Rd, Balliang East 3340	481ha	750-3500
Parwan Pty Ltd	3922-3684 Geelong-Bacchus Marsh Road, Parwan	307ha	500-2100
Sharkey	315 Sharkey Road, Balliang	397ha	1000-2700

\*Approximate range from supply year one to supply year 20

Each property requires a land capability assessment (LCA) to ensure that recycled water irrigation is an appropriate and sustainable activity for the site. Before recycled water irrigation can commence a customer site management plan (CSMP), detailing irrigation protocols and specific recycled water risk management, will also be developed for Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Victoria approval.

### 1.1 Scope of LCA

This land capability assessment report, specific to the Sharkey property, analyses and documents the following:

- Assessment of current and historic land use.
- Assessment of the landscape capability for use of recycled water.
- Calculation of the 10<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile irrigation requirements and summarise total water demand of the proposed irrigation design.
- Assessment of the nutrient leaching risk associated with recycled water.
- Assessment of the salinity risk associated with the application of recycled water.

This LCA is informed by a site visit (28 August 2018) a water quality review (Stantec, undated) and landowner interview (undertaken by Pinion Advisory Senior Agronomist Jason Lynch, September 2020).



# 2 Land use review

The proposed recycled water irrigation site is located at 315 Sharkey Road Balliang Victoria. Western Water have been in discussion with the landowner regarding potential recycled water supply from thee WIN project for several years. As a result, a concept irrigation design is well developed and attached as appendix A.

The land is currently used for mixed farming which includes dryland broadacre cropping for the produce of cereals (wheat and barley), lupins and canola, and pastoral use to run a self-replacing breeding sheep flock, finishing prime lambs and trading wethers.

The current property owners have owned this land since 1920 and are highly experienced crop and livestock managers. Interview with the landowners indicates that there are no historical land practices, or contaminants of concern, that might impact the irrigation development area.

The property owners operate a well-managed and organised mixed farming enterprise implementing appropriate land management and crop production practices including minimal tillage, soil moisture conservation, direct drilling, soil testing, agricultural chemical resistance management and sustainable crop rotations.

A number of applications of biosolids have been made on the property, with much of it applied on the ground associated with potential recycled water centre pivot A (CP-A). The CP-A pivot site is made up of three paddocks, west, middle and east with the biosolids applied as follows:

- West: 15 T/ha applied in 2018
- Middle: 45 T/ha applied in 2010
- East: 40 T/ha applied in 2002 and 35 T/ha applied in 2006

Biosolids, applied as a dewatered product at the time of sowing crops, have been incorporated into the soils by either a separate discing operation and/or when the crops are drilled. Once incorporated biosolids material is barely visible on the soil surface.

In order to effectively manage and match nutrient application with crop demand, it is recommended that the application of biosolids cease once the recycled water irrigation scheme commences operation. This has been discussed with the landowner. This recommended might be revisited once recycled water supply commences and accuracy of nutrient budgets is known.



# 3 Land capability assessment

The land capability assessment identifies the limitations associated with soil and landscape characteristics as relevant to the proposed irrigation development.

A soil reconnaissance and landscape survey was undertaken on 28<sup>th</sup> August 2018. Due to the uniformity of regional site conditions, only one soil pit was developed, analysed and sampled (Table 2). The location is shown on appendix B.

Table 2 Soil pit location

Soil pit ID	Easting	Northing
Sharkey	272788.2	5809624.5

The location of the representative soil pit within the proposed irrigation development area was based on discussion with the property owner, local landscape considerations and review of available satellite imagery. The uniformity of local soil conditions has be confirmed by review of the Assessment of Agricultural Land Capability in Melbourne's Green Wedge and Peri-Urban Areas (Agriculture Victoria, 2018), land suitability analysis of the Shire of Moorabool (DPI Vic, 2006), ASRIS datasets (CSIRO), a broader Balliang East district soil reconnaissance project undertaken on behalf of Western Water in 2018 (Macquarie Franklin), and a geotechnical report commissioned by Western Water as part of the WIN project development (CH2M Beca, 2019). Inspection of pits across each of the three WIN foundation properties (Table 1) also confirmed uniform conditions.

The review of the various available land capability, land suitability, soils, geotechnical and geology indicates this property is consistent covered a single soil type, as per that which was identified in the soil pit. Full description of this soil pit is attached as appendix C, recorded information includes:

- Soil texture, pedality and morphology of the each of the horizons
- Soil colour
- Depth of effective root zone
- Depth and layer of any impeding layer
- Presence of stone and rock
- Soil profile pH and nutrient status
- Profile drainage status
- Presence of any concretions in the soil profile.

Landscape and soil properties were assigned a suitability class based on Table 3. The detailed results are attached as appendix D.



#### Table 3 Land capability assessment description

Suitability	General description	Growth
class*		reduction
		(%)
1	Very few limitations present and easily overcome. Crop growth is expected to be	0
	unimpeded with minimal intervention required.	
2	Minor limitations affecting either productive land use and/or risk of degradation.	10
	Limitations overcome by careful management. Crop growth can be marginally impeded	
	by limitations if no intervention is undertaken.	
3	Moderate limitations significantly affecting productive land use and/or risk of	30
	degradation. Careful management and conservation measures required. Crop growth	
	can be significantly impeded if no intervention is undertaken.	
4	High degree of limitations not easily overcome by standard development techniques	60
	and/or resulting in high risk of degradation. Extensive conservation measures and	
	careful ongoing management required. Crop growth is significantly impeded	
	threatening crop survival.	
5	Severe limitations. Use is usually prohibited in terms of development costs or the	100
	associated risk of degradation. Crop survival unlikely and management not feasible.	

\* Adapted from Van Gool D, Tille P & Moore G, 2005 & FAO Soil Bulletin 32 1976 by Stantec (2018).

### 3.1 Soil and landscape features

The landscape around the property where the proposed irrigation development would occur consists of flat and very gently sloping land (0-3%) and is bisected by the ephemeral Balliang Creek waterway which flows through central north eastern area of the property (appendix A).

The flat to gently sloping nature of the land suggests it is suitable for broadscale irrigation which utilises spray irrigation application technology, as per centre pivot irrigation infrastructure.

All land included within the irrigation development area has been under the current property ownership since the early 1920s and has had a long history long history of cropping and pastoral use thereafter. Therefore, the land has been significantly modified in terms of an extended history of soil cultivation, de-stoning and the application of fertiliser and soil ameliorants (lime, gypsum and more recently biosolids).

The site inspection indicates the property is consistently covered by red sodosol soils, which features a clay loam A horizon over a clay B Horizon, with rock and stone fragments and calcium carbonate present in the B2 horizon.

Sodosols are texture contrast soils (duplex) which have lighter textured surface A horizon (e.g. sandy loam or clay loam) overlying a clayey sodic subsoil B horizon, typically an acidic A horizon soil that becomes more alkaline at depth and frequently include calcium carbonate precipitates.

The nutrient status of the soils indicates they have a moderate level of fertility, with the highlights being:



- Moderate phosphorus levels in the A horizon (49 mg/kg) with very low levels in the B1 and B2 horizon (<5 mg/kg).
- Moderate sulphur levels in the A and B1 horizon (16 and 14 mg/kg) with high levels in the B2 horizon (39 mg/kg).
- Slightly acidic pH in the A horizon (6.5) and alkaline soil pH in the B1 and B2 horizon (7.9 and 9.5).
- Elevated exchangeable sodium percentage in the A horizon (7.8%) and high in the B1 and B2 horizon (16% and 15%).
- Low electrical conductivity in the A, B1 and B2 horizon (0.09, 0.33 and 0.61 dS/m).
- Low soil organic carbon levels in the A, B1 and B2 horizons (1.2, 0.75 and <0.15%).
- Moderate phosphorus buffer index (PBI) value in the A1 horizon (160) which increases to very high in the B2 horizon (540) and high in the B2 horizon (200).
- Low Aluminium levels in the A, B1 and B2 horizons (<9.0 mg/kg).
- Below threshold levels for all heavy metals with the exception of an elevated Chromium level in the A horizon (157 mg/kg).

None of the nutrient levels present in the soil would be anticipated to negatively impact crop and/or pasture growth.

The chromium levels present in the A horizon are likely to be related to the geological parent material, and elevated levels (>100 mg/kg) have also be identified on similar red sodosol soils during a wider Balliang East 2018 soil survey.

The A horizon of these red sodosols are moderately well drained and the permeability of these soils is estimated to be approximately 15-20 mm/day (or 0.6-0.8mm/h). The clay nature of the B horizon would constrain the drainage capacity of the soil at depth, and this is evidenced by presence of slight cutans.

The accumulation of sodium in the soil A horizon of the profile could result in impairment of the soil's drainage capacity, and therefore the application of gypsum must be considered to mitigate the potential for soil sodicity.

Excessive, inappropriate irrigation and/or the application of recycled irrigation with an elevated sodium content could result in degradation of the soil's drainage capacity and lead to soil water logging.

### 3.2 Outcome of land capability assessment

A single soil group was identified, being the red sodosol which can be characterised as moderately well drained.



The various characteristics and features of the landscape and red sodosol soil were assigned a rating and the property is assessed as having a suitability score of 1.8. The land capability assigned is therefore Class 2 (appendix D) with generally minor limitations for recycled water irrigation.

It is noted that due to elevated sodium content of these soils sodicity must be carefully monitored. The application of gypsum will be required to positively manage the soil's permeability and overall drainage capacity.



# 4 Irrigation water balance

The assessment of irrigation application rates uses a water balance model which includes inputs from climate, crop water usage and elements of the land capability assessment. The outcome is an analysis of the variation in irrigation requirements based on variable annual rainfall.

### 4.1 Rainfall and evaporation

Rainfall and evaporation data (Table 4) has been generated by a combination of using the available rainfall records from Balliang East Bureau of Meteorology weather station #087008, (1970-2020) and evaporation modelling data generated using SILO modelling.

East Balliang receives a median annual rainfall of 464mm and has an expected annual pan evaporation of 1298mm. Median monthly rainfall does not exceed the pan evaporation rate at any time of year. The annual 10<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles and minimum and maximum median rainfall, pan evaporation and evapotranspiration values are shown in Table 5.

		<b>10</b> <sup>th</sup>	50 <sup>th</sup>	90 <sup>th</sup>	
	Minimum	percentile	percentile	percentile	Maximum
Rainfall (mm)	225	328	464	615	797
Pan evaporation					
(mm)	1062	1166	1298	1440	1540
Evapotranspiration					
(mm)	1062	979	1090	1210	1540

#### Table 4 Annual rainfall, evaporation and evapotranspiration statistics

#### Table 5 Median rainfall, evaporation and evapotranspiration by month

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Rainfall (mm)	32.4	40.1	33.9	37.7	36	32.4	33.7	36.8	44.7	48.8	44.5	43.1
Pan evaporation (mm)	196.8	165.5	133.4	85.3	52.8	38.1	44.8	60.1	83.9	119.6	143.4	179.1
Evapotranspiration (mm)	165.3	139.0	112.1	71.7	44.4	32.0	37.6	50.5	70.5	100.5	120.5	150.4

The crop demand, determined using crop coefficients and potential evapotranspiration, for lucerne and winter wheat are outlined in Table 6.



#### Table 6 Lucerne and winter wheat crop coefficients

Monthly crop coefficient												
Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec										Dec		
Lucerne	1.14	1.08	1.02	0.96	0.84	0.66	0.66	0.78	0.9	1.02	1.14	1.2
Winter												
wheat	0	0	0.7	0.8	1	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	0.8	0.4	0.2

The water balance indicates that in a median rainfall year a lucerne pasture would require 7.8 ML/ha of irrigation, whilst a winter wheat crop would require 2.5 ML/ha of irrigation. The complete irrigation requirements for lucerne and winter wheat crops are summarised in Table 7.

Lucerne and wheat represent the highest and lowest irrigation demand of the likely crop options, however a rotation of crops might include including barley, canola, lupins, peas and soybeans.

#### Table 7 Total annual irrigation requirements for lucerne and winter wheat

	Minimum rainfall	10 <sup>th</sup> %ile rainfall	50 <sup>th</sup> %ile rainfall	90 <sup>th</sup> %ile rainfall	Maximum rainfall
Lucerne	11.1	10	7.8	7	2.2
Winter wheat	4.6	4.1	2.5	1.3	0

# 5 Irrigation concept design and demand

The irrigation concept design is attached as appendix A. The detail of the proposed irrigation plan is outlined in Table 8 which summarises potential water use of each pivot area.

Centre pivot	Area (ha)	Сгор	Total irrigation demand (ML)			
			10 <sup>th</sup>	50 <sup>th</sup>	90 <sup>th</sup>	
			percentile	percentile	percentile	
CP-A	176	Lucerne	1760	1372	1232	
		Wheat	651	387	211	
CP-B	28	Lucerne	280	218	196	
		Wheat	103	61	33	
CP-C	102	Lucerne	1020	795	714	
		Wheat	377	224	122	
CP-D	26	Lucerne	260	202	182	
		Wheat	96	60	31.2	

Table 8 Irrigation areas and estimated water demand (Lucerne or wheat) under various climate scenarios



CP-E	74	Lucerne	740	577	518
		Wheat	274	162	89

### 5.1 Buffer zones and offsite risk management

Buffer zones and irrigation controls are necessary to ensure that recycled water remains on the identified property and that sensitive receptors are protected from unintentional irrigation spray drift.

The key risk areas on and adjacent to the property include:

- Two residential dwellings,
- an onfarm bulk grain handling facility,
- Balliang Creek,
- Sharkey's road, Agars Road, Mt Rothwell Road and Bacchus Marsh Road, and
- a piggery to the immediate east of Pivot E.

No drains are present on any land which is to have recycled irrigation water applied.

In line with the *Guidelines for Environmental Management: Use of Reclaimed Water (EPA Victoria, 2003)* buffer zones, as identified in appendix A, are summarised in 9.

#### Table 9 Recycled water irrigation buffer requirements

Receptor	Distance
On farm dwellings and grain handling	100m
area	
Balliang Creek	50m
Neighbouring piggery	200m (which includes piggery requirement for
	50m setback to Agars Rd, and Agars Rd itself).
External boundaries	50m

In addition to buffer zones, it is recommended that the following practices be implemented to minimise the risk of off-site movement of recycled water:

- Adopt deficit irrigation practices where water is to be applied to crops and pasture such that it will be immediately used by the plants. This limits potential for soil water logging and surface water runoff.
- Implement appropriate irrigation scheduling, such that it is consistent with the soil's permeability. Selection of a suitable centre pivot nozzle pack is important.



- Include anemometer controllers to shut down the centre pivot under a combination of excessive wind speed and specific directions.
- Monitor the soil nutrient levels to minimise the potential excessive sodium accumulation which can impact permeability.

Centre pivots irrigators will be used to apply recycled water. In comparison to other irrigation options, pivot irrigation has low labour requirements, allows high level of control over the volumes and distribution of water, providing ability to closely match irrigation to crop/pasture requirements and soil permeability characteristics. No end guns will be fitted to the centre pivots due to the high risk of irrigation water spray drift and associated unwanted off-site movement of recycled irrigation water.

The principle of operation will be to include Variable Rate Irrigation control (VRI) on area which requirement specific nozzles to be switched off to protect buffer zones in specific areas (current design shows this on Pivot areas A, B and E). This is setup by a GIS map within the irrigator control system, such that it doesn't require manual intervention.



# 6 Surface water risk management

Balliang Creek, which transects the proposed irrigation areas, presents as the key surface water risk (appendix A).

Due to relatively flat topography, the risk of unintentional off site movement of irrigated water is low. However, the following measures are recommended to prevent surface water contamination:

- Utilisation of centre pivot irrigation equipment which allows maximum control of irrigation direction and application rates.
- Adherence to 50m irrigation buffer zones to Balliang Creek which flows through the property. This may require the use of variable rate irrigation (VRI) technology on the irrigation infrastructure to switch off individual nozzles that may encroach on the 50m area.
- Deficit irrigation planning, such that the amount of recycled irrigation water applied is relative to the crop water usage and weather conditions and the potential for soil waterlogging conditions occurring is minimised.
- The centre pivot is to be designed to apply recycled irrigation water at 15mm per application which is commensurate with the soil's permeability.
- Ongoing monitoring of soil sodicity to ensure that the permeability of the soil is not compromised. The requirement for treatment with gypsum will need ongoing review.

With these measure in place, the risk to surface water from the proposed irrigation design is very low.



# 7 Nutrient leaching and groundwater risk management

### 7.1 Nutrient management

The intial WIN development will connect Bacchus Marsh and Melton recycled water plants, with Sunbury to be collected in year three of the project (2025). For the purposes of this nutrient budget, supply from Sunbury (which contains comparatively low nutrients and will therefore reduce the WIN nutrient supply once it comes online) has been excluded. The longer term result is that assessment is very conservative.

Average nitrogen of 17.6 mg/L and average total phosphorus of 8.2 mg/L have been adopted to inform the nutrient budget (Stantec, undated) summarised in Table 10.

	10 <sup>th</sup> percentile irrigation				90 <sup>th</sup> percentile irrigation			
	Lucerne		Wheat		Lucerne		Wheat	
	N	Р	N	Р	N	Ρ	N	Ρ
Irrigation applied (ML)	7	7	4.1	4.1	10	10	1.3	1.3
Nutrient concentration (mg/ML)	17.6	8.2	17.6	8.2	17.6	8.2	17.6	8.2
Nutrient applied (kg/ha)	123	57	72	34	176	82	23	8
Yield (t DM/ha)	16	16	8	8	16	16	8	8
Nutrient content (kg T DM)	30	3	20	2.5	30	3	20	2.5
Nutrient removed (kg/ha)	480	48	160	20	480	48	160	20
Soil factor P sorption rate (kg P/ha)		14.5		14.5		14.5		14.5
Net balance (kg/ha)	-357	-5	-88	-1	-304	20	-137	-26

Table 10 Recycled water nutrient budget summary

The nutrient budget (Table 10) indicates that the application of recycled irrigation water will contribute only a small portion of nitrogen and phosphorus removed during the wheat cropping and lucerne production enterprise. This applies in a 10th percentile rainfall year where recycled water application will be at its highest.

Additionally the soil has a moderate to very high phosphorus sorption capacity. PBI values range from 160 in the A horizon and 540 and 200 in the B1 and B2 horizon which further positively influence the soil's ability to retain phosphorus (Corangamite Catchment Management Authority, 2013).



It is reasonable to consider that the land manager will be required to apply additional nitrogen and phosphorus to the soil to optimise lucerne and wheat production. This should be informed by ongoing soil monitoring in irrigated areas.

The nutrient budget in conjunction with the soil phosphorus sorption capacity indicates the proposed application of recycled irrigation water would not be expected to result in nitrogen or phosphorus leaching into the local groundwater.

### 7.2 Groundwater

The property lies within the Western Port Philip groundwater catchment, defined as an upper basalt aquifer that flows in a southerly direction towards Port Philip Bay. The depth of the upper aquifer at the Sharkey property is expected to be greater than 5m, and the ground water salinity (TDS) ranges from 2000-10000 mg/L (Visualising Victoria's Groundwater, 2020), significanly higher than the proposed recycled water supply.

A number of bores are present on the property in question and nearby land, range in depth from 48 to 146m, although none are known to be monitored. Bore locations are marked on appendix B and data is summarised in appendix E.

The majoirty of these bores have been drilled to assist with the identification and potential utilisation of the brown coal deposit which extends throughout the Balliang East district.

The landowner (Chris Sharkey) has advised that two bores, WRK972156 and 47306, are still used to supply stock water. They are recognised as being saline but still suitable for livestock consumption, though no formal/routine water quality testing occurs. Bore 47306 is located to the north-east of proposed pivot B (adjacent to Sharkey Road), bore WRK972156 is not within the recycled irrigation water development area on the Sharkey property.

The risk of nutrient leaching into the ground water from recycled water irrigaiton is considered to be of low. This is due to the following:

- 1. Irrigation planning is designed as deficit irrigation. This practice ensures that the opportunity for soil waterlogging is minimised.
- 2. The nutrient budget (Table 10) indictes that the nutrient load to be applied from recycld water is low relative to the nutrient removal of wheat and lucerne pasture.
- 3. The clay nature of the red sodosols soils are not considered susceptible to leaching. Soil PBIs range from moderate to very high.
- 4. The basalt geology of the district forms a relatively impermeable layer, protecting groundwater from surface activity.



# 8 Soil salinity and sodicity risk management

### 8.1 Salinity risk assessment

The development of saline soil conditions would negatively impact the production of lucerne pastures and crops.

Western Water have advised that the target salinity of the WIN class C recycled water supply is an electrical conductivity of  $<750\mu/cm$ . Landowners are to be notified if electrical conductivity exceeds  $1000\mu$ S/cm.

Salinity tolerances of lucerne and wheat (DPI, 2016) are summarised in Table 11.

Table 11 Salinity tolerances of lucerne and wheat

	Irrigation Water Salinity (dS/m)					
Crop performance	No reduction	10% reduction	20% reduction			
Lucerne	1.3	2.2	3.6			
Wheat	4	4.9	6.3			

Based on these salinity tolerances (Table 11) it is possible to determine the minimum leaching requirement (MLR) in order to maintain target crop performance.

Where: MLR is the minimum leaching requirement
 ECWA is the EC of the available irrigation water (dS/m)
 ECWY % is the salinity level of the irrigation water that results in a specified percentage yield loss.

If the most salt sensitive crop is considered (lucerne) it is calculated that 5.6% additional fresh water (in addition to the irrigation water requirements) is required during the irrigation season (September to April) in order to prevent a reduction in growth. This equates to between 0.4 to 0.56 ML/ha (10<sup>th</sup> to 90<sup>th</sup> percentile irrigation seasons) or 43-56mm/ha of rainfall. It should be noted that during the lucerne irrigation season the East Balliang area receives 325mm in median rainfall year. This significantly exceeds the freshwater leaching requirement.

Based on this calculation, and local rainfall data, it is unlikely that the salinity of the WIN recycled water supply would result in a reduction in lucerne crop yield.



### 8.2 Sodicity risk assessment

The soils currently have an elevated level of sodicity (as measured by exchangeable sodium percentage, ESP) in the A horizon (ESP 7.8%) and it would be appropriate to apply gypsum at 2.5 T/ha prior to the application of the recycled irrigation water.

The potential for increasing sodicity of the soil, and associated impairment in soil permeability and drainage capacity, is a function of the sodium content of the recycled irrigation water, measured as sodium absorption ration (SAR).

The annual average SAR of the WIN recycled water supply is anticipated to be less than 4.6 (Stantec, undated). Irrigation water with an SAR <3 is considered low risk but where the SAR is >6 the risk of soil impact significantly increases (DPI NSW, 2016).

Based on the forecast recycled water salinity and SAR value there is a moderate risk of increasing the sodicity levels of the soil, and based on the ongoing soil analysis data it would be appropriate to apply 2.5 T/ha gypsum to irrigation areas if the ESP of the soils exceeds 10%.

In order to manage the risk of rising soil sodicity, and maintain soil permeability and drainage characteristics, it is recommended that annual soil analysis be undertaken and ESP data be used to inform an ongoing gypsum application program.

### 8.3 Soil monitoring

Prior to commencement of irrigation, representative soil sampling transects are to be established across each of the proposed irrigation areas. Baseline sampling and analysis (prior to commencement of irrigation) is essential. Ongoing monitoring of topsoil (0-10cm) and subsoil (10-30cm) for nutrient status, pH, salinity and sodicity levels will be required.

Standard soil testing analytes are included in appendix C

A nutrient budget reconciliation should form part of the annual soil monitoring program, and this must be based on a review of the nutrient inputs (fertiliser and recycled water) and removal (pasture and crop yields and phosphorus sorption impact) and determine the potential for unnecessary soil nutrient accumulation.



# 9 Conclusions and recommendations

The land capability assessment has identified the land associated with the proposed recycled water irrigation development can be considered suitable for the intended use.

- The property has been under the same ownership since the 1920s and used for cropping and pasture. As a consequence, the land has undergone significant modification in terms of cultivation, soil fertility, destoning and vegetation cover.
- The landscape and soils have a class 2 suitability rating.
- Red sodosol soils uniformly cover the property, and these are considered to have a minor restriction to the application of recycled water irrigation.
- Prior to irrigation commencing, soil sampling transects are to be established and soil sampling is to then occur on an annual basis to ensure the soil nutrient, salinity and sodicity levels remain appropriate.
- While soil conditions are not prohibitive to irrigation it is recommended that gypsum applied to irrigation areas at 2.5 T/ha prior to the application of the recycled water. This action will proactively manage the potential for rising soil sodium levels and soil exchangeable sodium percentage. Annual monitoring of soil ESP will inform an ongoing gypsum application program.
- The 50<sup>th</sup> percentile annual application for Lucerne pasture is anticipated to be 7.8 ML/ha, and for a wheat crop is anticipated to be 2.5 ML/ha.
- The 10<sup>th</sup> percentile annual application for Lucerne pasture is anticipated to be 10 ML/ha, and for a wheat crop is anticipated to be 4.1 ML/ha.
- Risks associated with soil salinity and nutrient leaching are considered low.
- The proposed recycled water irrigation development covers 397 hectares. Buffer zones to Balliang Creek, the neighbouring piggery and on farm dwellings are grain stores have been included in the concept design. These must be adhered to as the development progresses.
- Centre pivot irrigators equipped with VRI technology and low drift sprinkler are the preferred irrigation infrastructure for the site.
- The property is well suited to the proposed recycled water irrigation development.



# **10** References

CSIRO, Australian Soils Resource Information System (ASRIS), Retrieved from: http://www.asris.csiro.au/mapping/viewer.htm

Agriculture Victoria, 2018. Assessment of Agricultural Land Capability in Melbourne's Green Wedge and Peri-urban Areas.

CH2M Beca, 2019. Parwan to Balliang Irrigation District: Geotechnical Investigation Factual and Interpretive Report. Australia.

Corangamite Catchment Management Authority, 2013. Brown Book.

Department of Primary Industries, Victorian Government, 2006. Grow Est Land Suitability Analysis of the Shire of Moorabool.

Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development, Western Australia, 2019. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.agric.wa.gov.au/fruit/water-salinity-and-plant-irrigation</u>

Department of Primary Industries, NSW, 2016. Salinity tolerance in irrigated crops, 2016 Primefact 1345. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/\_\_data/assets/pdf\_file/0005/523643/Salinity-tolerance-in-irrigated-crops.pdf</u>

Finger, L. & M. Morris, 2005. *Water Management Options: Assisting irrigators with streamflow management plan implementation*. Department of Primary Industries Victoria.

Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United States, 1976. *Soil Bulletin 32: A framework for land evaluation*, Rome.

Macquarie Franklin, 2018, Balliang East Soil Reconnaissance Report, WIN Project (unpublished report prepared for Western Water).

Stantec, 2018. Western Water Land Capability Assessment, 187 Portingales Lane, Romsey.

Stantec, undated. Memo: Western Irrigation Network, Water Quality Review.

Visualising Victoria's Groundwater, 2020. Retrieved from: www.vvg.org.au

Van Gool D, Tille P & G. Moore, 2005. *Land evaluation standards for land resources mapping*, 3<sup>rd</sup> *edition*, Resource Management Technical report 298, ISSN 1039-7205.



# **11** Appendices

Appendix A: Irrigation concept design map





Appendix B: Soil map with groundwater bore identification





# Appendix C: Soil profile assessment

#### Table 12: Sharkey test pit soil profile

Site	Soil description	Image
Soil type: - red sodosol	A1: red clay loam to 15cm, moderate crumb structure 3-5mm, abundant fine roots, no coarse fragments with a diffused boundary to:	
- gently sloping ground with no stone and/or rock fragments on the surface.	A2: red clay loam to 30cm, moderate/coarse crumb structure 5-10mm, many fine roots, no coarse fragments with a clear boundary to:	
Effective rooting depth: - 300mm.	B1: red clay to 60cm, cutans present, blocky structure, common fine roots, occasional large fragments (50+mm)	is open or equilibrium of the second s
- Moderate in the A1 and A2 horizon to poorly drained in the B1 and B2 horizon.	B2: red/brown clay to 130cm, blocky structure, occasional fine roots (maximum depth to 900mm), frequent large fragments (50+mm), carbonate deposits present	



#### Table 13 Sharkey test pit soil nutrient status

		Limit Ranges		Unit		Horizon	
Analyte		Lower	Upper		A (0-30cm)	B1 (30-60cm)	B2 (60-120cm)
Sample ID (Nutrient Advantage)					22033671	22033655	22033670
pH (1:5 water)		6	9		6.5	7.9	9.5
Electrical conductivity (1:5 SE)		4		dS/m	0.09	0.33	0.61
Chloride		100		mg/kg	20	78	120
Nitrate nitrogen		2		mg/kg	0.7	0.7	<0.5
Ammonia nitrogen				mg/kg	1.9	2.4	<0.6
Total nitrogen (kjeldahl)				mg/kg	0.14	0.11	<0.04
Phosphorus (Colwell)		40		mg/kg	49	<5	<5
Phosphorus buffer index					160	540	200
Cation Exchangeable Capacity					8.58	26	47.6
Exchangeable sodium percentage	9	6	15	%	7.8	16	15
Aluminium saturation			1	%	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Copper DPTA		0.5	2	mg/kg	1.1	1.4	0.64
Iron DPTA		4.5		mg/kg	29	9.4	10
Manganese DPTA		15	30	mg/kg	20	3.2	1
Zinc DPTA		0.7	20	mg/kg	0.6	0.04	0.04
Sulphur (KCl40)		10		mg/kg	16	14	39
Organic carbon (Walkley & Black)	)	1.74	2.62	%	1.2	0.75	<0.15
Aluminium (KCl)				mg/kg	<9.00	<9.00	<9.00
Calcium (Ammonium acetate)		60	80	%	40	23	39
Magnesium (Ammonium acetate	)	15	30	%	32	49	39
Potassium (Ammonium acetate)		5	10	%	19	12	6.6
Phosphorus environmental risk ir	ndex				0.31	0.01	0.03
Grass tetany risk index					0.27	0.17	0.08
Sample ID (ALS)		Metal le HIL	s trigger vels EIL		EM1813998004	EMI181399800	5 EMI1813998006
Arsenic		100	40	mg/kg	7	7	<5
Cadmium		20		mg/kg	<1	<1	<1
Chromium		100	130	mg/kg	157	97	84
Cobalt		100		mg/kg	20	21	16
Copper		6000	49	mg/kg	18	26	17
Lead		300	470	mg/kg	16	7	7
Manganese		3800		mg/kg	494	250	646
Nickel		400	37.5	mg/kg	38	74	51
Zinc		7400	66	mg/kg	21	19	21
Mercury		40		mg/kg	<0.1	0.1	<0.1
Above desired level	Below	desired le	evel	Pote	entially a problem/t	oxic Conditi	on problematic/toxic



# Appendix D: Land capability score

#### Table 14 LCA scoring method

	Capability rating					
Score	1	2	3	4	5	
Level of restriction to recycled water irrigation	Nil	Minor	Moderate	Major	Severe	

Adapted from Van Gool D, Tille P & Moore G, 2005 & FAO Soil Bulletin 32, 1976 by Stantec (2018).

#### Table 15 Soil and landscape suitability score for the Sharkey property

Landscape properties	Capability Rating
Slope (%)	1
Surface rock (%)	1
Inundation/flooding	1
Depth to regional water table	2
Soil properties	
Surface texture (%clay)	2
Surface ESP (0-40cm) (%)	3
Subsoil ESP (40-100cm) (%)	5
Surface salinity (ECe (0-70cm) (dS/m)	1
Subsoil salinity (ECe (70-100cm) (dS/m)	1
Effective rooting depth (cm)	1
Solum depth (cm)	1
Surface infiltration (mm/h)	1
Profile drainage status	3
AWC within ERZ (mm)	2
Surface pH (field)	1
CEC (40-100cm) (meq/100g)	2
Overall suitability rating	1.8 (Class 2)
Potential development area (ha)	397



# Appendix E: Local groundwater bore identification

Data has been retrieved from www.vvg.org.au (14 September 2020)

Bore	Year	Depth	Use (where known)	Monitoring
Identificiation	Constructed			
number				
WRK041045	2002	103	Dewatering/coal	No
WRK041046	2002	103	exploration	No
WRK041047	2002	103		No
WRK041048	2002	103		No
WRK043164	-	-	-	No
WRK043165	-	-	-	No
WRK043167	-	-	-	No
WRK043183	-	-	-	No
WRK051872	2014	72	Observation/coal	No
WRK051895	2014	131	exploration	No
WRK051897	2014	72		No
WRK051900	2014	128		No
WRK051901	2014	70		No
WRK051902	2014	127		No
WRK972156	2006	48	Domestic and stock (in	No
			use)	
81970	1925	146	-	No
301335	1981	114	-	No
47306	1984	35	Domestic and stock (in use)	No

Table 16 Bore identification on and nearby to the Sharkey recycled irrigation development site

