DESERT KNOWLEDGE CRC

The Working Paper Series

WaterSmart Pastoral Production™ Project Literature Reviews

Loss of storage water through evaporation with particular reference to arid and semi-arid zone pastoralism in Australia

Ian P. Craig

WaterSmart
pastoral
production™

CRC
AUSTRALIA

Loss of storage water through evaporation with particular reference to arid and semi-arid zone pastoralism in Australia

Ian P. Craig

2008

WaterSmart Pastoral Production™ project participants

Australian Government **Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry** National Landcare Program	Gail Stevenson Manager National Landcare Program	www.daff.gov.au
desert channels QUEENSLAND	Colleen James Project Officer WaterSmart Pastoral Production™	www.dcq.org.au
Northern Territory Government	Andy Bubb Project Manager	www.primaryindustry.nt.gov.au
Government of South Australia South Australian Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board	John Gavin General Manager	www.saalnrm.sa.gov.au
GREAT ARTESIAN BASIN COORDINATING COMMITTEE	Derek White Great Artesian Basin Coordinating Committee Australian Government Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts	www.gabcc.org.au

Citation

Ian Craig is a researcher with the University of Southern Queensland. He can be contacted at Ian.Craig@usq.edu.au.

The Desert Knowledge Cooperative Research Centre is an unincorporated joint venture with 28 partners whose mission is to develop and disseminate an understanding of sustainable living in remote desert environments, deliver enduring regional economies and livelihoods based on Desert Knowledge, and create the networks to market this knowledge in other desert lands.

Acknowledgements

For additional information please contact

Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Acronyms

AWS	Automated Weather Stations
BREB	Bowen Ratio Energy Balance
CMH	Cooled Mirror Hygrometer
CRC	Cooperative research Centre
EMT	Evaporation Mitigation Techniques
ET	Evapotranspiration
FAO 56	Food and Agricultural Organisation (of the United Nations) Technical Paper 56
HDPE	High density polyethylene
FLUXNET	Flux and Energy Exchange Network
LAS	Large Aperture Scintillometry
LIDAR	UV Laser based scanning radar
NCEA	National Centre for Engineering in Agriculture, University of Southern Queensland
NLWRA	National Land and Water Resources Audit
OASIS	Observations at Several Interacting Scales
PST	Pressure Sensitive Transducer
PVS	Polyvinyl stearate
NRM&W	Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Water (Queensland)
RWUEI	Rural Water Use Efficiency Initiative
SEBAL	Surface Energy Balance Model
USQ	University of Southern Queensland
VPD	Vapour Pressure Deficit
WVD	Water Vapour Deficit

Objective of review

To undertake an international literature review on the loss of storage water through surface evaporation. This includes the impact water evaporation has on semi-arid and arid livestock pastoral enterprises, the technologies available to reduce water evaporation and an assessment of their applicability, cost and practicality for arid zone pastoralism.

1. Introduction

1.1 Water loss due to evaporation

With increasing environmental concern and focus on irrigation water use efficiency, there is now considerable pressure on us all to optimise, as far as possible, the use of our most precious resource: water. The rate of evaporation is in excess of 2 m per year over most of Australia's landmass and mean rainfall in Australia is less than 500 mm per year and falling. It has been estimated that up to 95 per cent of the rain which falls in Australia evaporates and does not contribute to runoff.

When harvested, water is commonly stored in small storages and dams, but it is estimated that up to half of this may be lost to evaporation. This represents a huge waste of our resource. The price and value of water are increasing dramatically and the scarcity of water is the main limiting factor working against agricultural production in Australia.

Australia has approximately 500 large dams with a combined capacity of 80 000 GL, roughly equivalent to four times the annual amount of surface water diverted (NLWRA 2001a). Australia has several million farm dams which account for an estimated 9 per cent of the total water stored, or approximately 7000 GL (Environment Australia 2000). Assuming that these small dams on average contain water only 50 per cent of the time, and assuming that 40 per cent of this is lost to evaporation, it can therefore be roughly argued that the total agricultural water lost to evaporation is probably around 1400 GL. There is great uncertainty in this figure however, as the last two quantities are largely unknown. A scoping style research study is urgently required to obtain more accurate and quantitative data in this area.

The amount of water lost to evaporation from storages depends on many factors including atmospheric evaporative demand, the size of the water storage and storage method. There have been many attempts to reduce evaporation losses by altering how the water is stored. Water loss from storage dams can firstly be managed by increasing their depth and secondly by installing a good quality liner to prevent seepage. Circulation of cold bottom water (destratification) has been used successfully in deep storages (storages greater than 20 m) but is inappropriate in most agricultural storages which are generally less than 7 m deep. Windbreaks can also be used in certain circumstances, but their overall effect in reducing evaporation is likely to be small, because solar radiation, rather than wind, is the key driver of evaporation.

A realistic management option is to invest in a cover over the dam to reduce evaporation. The National Centre for Engineering in Agriculture (NCEA), University of Southern Queensland (USQ), has been recently involved in a DNR (RWUEI) funded project to assess the relative effectiveness and economic viability of different types of cover for storage evaporation control. The control methods investigated include chemical monolayers, floating covers and shade structures (Craig & Hancock 2004). To evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of each evaporation reduction method, accurate methods for measuring actual evaporation loss were developed as part of the project. A brief description of the method is also included in this review.

1.2 Definitions of evapotranspiration

Evapotranspiration is the 'transfer of water, as water vapour, to the atmosphere from both vegetated and unvegetated land surfaces' (BOM 2006). While it is more common to describe 'evaporation' when discussing open water surfaces and bare soil, and 'evapotranspiration' when discussing land surfaces with vegetation, the term 'evaporation' will be used here.

Areal actual ET

This is the ET that actually takes place, under the condition of ***existing water supply***, from an area so large that the effects of any upwind boundary transitions are negligible and local variations are integrated to an areal average.

Areal potential ET

This is the ET that would take place, under the condition of ***unlimited water supply***, from an area so large that the effects of any upwind boundary transitions are negligible and local variations are integrated to an areal average.

Point potential ET

This is the ET that would take place, under the condition of unlimited water supply, from an area so small that the ***local ET effects do not alter local air mass properties***. It is assumed that latent and sensible heat transfers within the height of measurement are through convection only.

(BOM 2006)

By definition, point potential ET, is the ET from a 'point' with unlimited water supply. An example is a very small irrigated field surrounded by unirrigated land. By definition, point potential ET is very similar to the Penman-Monteith potential ET. The latter, although defined for a large area, also assumes that the actual ET does not affect the overpassing air. However, the estimates of the two are not quite the same because they are calculated differently.

ET maps provided by the Bureau of Meteorology are not intended for use in estimating open-water evaporation. Analysis techniques recommended in well-known hydrological texts dealing with open-water bodies should be used. However, ***point potential ET may be taken as a rough preliminary estimate of evaporation from small water bodies such as farm dams and shallow water storages***.

1.3 Evaporative loss of water in the context of arid and semi-arid zone pastoralism in Australia

Over the last few years, Australian consumption of water has varied between dry and wet years from about 14 000 and 24 000 GL/yr. The figure depends on water availability which can be highly variable from year to year. Approximately 65–75 per cent of total water consumption is used for irrigated agriculture. The precise figure varies significantly, but it is estimated that on average approximately 30 per cent is used by the Australian pastoral and grains industry (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Approximate mean use of agricultural water in Australia (derived from Australian Bureau of Statistics 2001; 2004)

Arid zone pastoralism is defined as pastoralism in areas with less than 250 mm/year mean rainfall, whereas semi-arid zone pastoralism is defined as pastoralism in areas with between 250 mm and 500 mm/year mean rainfall. The distribution of arid/semi-arid pastoralism in relation to Australia's rainfall and evaporation is illustrated in Figure 2. Further information on Australia's pastoral industry in general may be obtained from the NLWRA/EA website (Figure 3).

Figure 2: Australian rainfall (top left), point potential evaporation (top right) and regions of arid/semi-arid zone pastoralism (northern zone bottom left, southern zone bottom right)

Source: BOM 2006

Beef producing regions

Figure 8.7 Beef distribution - percentage by statistical local area.

Percentage of Australian beef (%)
- > 0.8
- 0.6 - 0.8
- 0.4 - 0.6
- 0.2 - 0.4
- < 0.2

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics
National Land and Water Resources Audit 2001.
Data used are assumed to be correct as received
from the data suppliers.
©Commonwealth of Australia.

Figure 8.10 Distribution of National Feedlot Accreditation Scheme accredited feedlots 2000

Source: AUS-MEAT limited

- Northern high rainfall zone
- Southern high rainfall zone
- Northern temperate zone
- Southern temperate zone
- Northern pastoral zone
- Southern pastoral zone

Figure 3: Beef producing regions in Australia

Notes: Further useful information on Australian Pastoralism
available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2003) and the National Land and Water Resources
Audit, 2001b

2. Different types of cover

This section describes the three major classes of cover that exist for water storages: floating (continuous or modular), suspended shade structures, and chemical monolayers.

2.1 Continuous plastic sheet

Floating covers in general act as an impermeable barrier that floats on the water surface to reduce evaporation. Many different materials have been trialled in the past including wax, foam and polystyrene, but polyethylene plastic has proved to be the most satisfactory and durable material for covers of this type.

Figure 4: Plastic cover (E-VapCap®) newly installed at Moons Farm, St. George Qld

The above photograph (Figure 4) was taken from the air and shows the newly installed Evaporation Control Systems E-VapCaps® product covering Moons dam near St. George. The plastic material consists of a unique, multi-layered, polyethylene membrane 540 microns in thickness. The material contains buoyancy cells, similar to bubble wrap or existing swimming pool cover products, but is made from much tougher material to resist degradation from sunlight. The multi-layering enables it to reflect some of the sun's heat as the top of the material is white, while the under layers are black, completely eliminating the transmission of light to the water underneath. The material is environmentally safe – the polyethylene used is commonly used in food packaging and storing and can be recycled. Tests have demonstrated that when well managed it is over 95 per cent effective in reducing evaporation from open storages. There are now a number of covers that have been installed on water storages in SW Queensland, using specialised equipment designed and built for the installation of covers on water. Existing test sites include, Meandarra, Stanthorpe, Barossa and North Star feedlot.

2.2 Suspended covers

Shade structures in general are suspended above the water surface using cables. Figure 5 shows Netpro black monofilament shadecloth supported by steel cables tensioned to 1 500 kg and attached to cement blocks set 2 metres into the bank. The cloth is available in a range of percentage-of-UV-reduction ratings. The cable structure has a design life in excess of 30 years, and the shadecloth may or may not have to be replaced once during this period, depending on the extent of storm damage over the period. Hail shoots or valves can be installed into the cloth to reduce potential damage.

Figure 5: Shadecloth cover installed at Andreatta's Farm, Stanthorpe Qld

Shade structures reduce solar radiation and wind speed, and trap humid air between the structure and the water surface. These are all factors that affect evaporation. Shadecloth can handle water being emptied from the dam, as the cover is not in contact with the water. In general, shade structures are not quite as effective in reducing evaporation as well managed plastic covers, but they are likely to suffer fewer problems. As the cloth is suspended it dries out quickly after rainfall. This means that wind blown soil does not collect on the surface (it either blows off or falls through) and the growth of weeds or algae on the cover surface is therefore very unlikely.

Shade structures are economically feasible for small storages less than 10 hectares in size, although the rising price of agricultural water may allow installation over larger agricultural storages. The main disadvantage of this product is the relatively high capital outlay (mainly labour cost for construction), but this has now been offset with a new shadecloth knitting machine located in Malaysia which will produce a much wider roll and will therefore involve the installation of fewer cables. More research also needs to be carried out into the aerodynamics of suspended structures in high wind speeds. A limiting factor may be the ability to satisfactorily anchor the cables in poor quality soils.

2.3 Modular covers

Modular covers are similar to continuous plastic covers except that they comprise multiple individual units which are not restrained and are free to move across the water surface. Therefore, in theory, installation is less expensive for modular covers than it is for continuous cover types. The evaporation reduction performance from modular covers will depend on how tightly the modules pack together, and therefore may be slightly lower than for continuous plastic floating cover types. Existing prototypes (see Figure 6) include a circular design (AquaCaps) and a hexagonal design (AquaGuard® Water Innovations). There is also a rectangular design (Raftex, Integrated Packaging).

Figure 6: Two types of modular cover, a hexagonal design (AquaGuard®, left) and a circular design (AquaCaps®, right)

As each module is small in size, thousands of modules are required to cover the storage. At present the AquaCaps module is being evaluated for the protection of water used in the mining industry and the Water Innovations module is being evaluated for the protection of urban water.

As modules do not cover 100 per cent of the surface, their evaporation saving performance will be correspondingly less than 100 per cent. However, as they are free floating they will travel with the wind to the downwind margins of the dam and this is often where the warmest water is and where the highest evaporation occurs.

2.4 Chemical covers

The most commonly used chemical monolayer is a long chain cetyl alcohol (C16-C18) which forms a one-molecule-thick oily layer on the surface of the water. As these layers are degradable, there is a need to reapply the chemical every two to four days. With small storages the product can be applied by hand from the bank as the chemical has some self-spreading ability. With larger storages however, some sort of mechanised delivery system is required (Figure 7). In tests, chemical methods have generally proved to be not as effective as physical methods in reducing evaporation. The performance in tests was possibly affected by wind, UV radiation, algae and bacteria. Despite only a low evaporation saving, the main advantage of monolayers is the low initial setup cost. Additionally, the product need be applied only when it is required, for example when the dam is full and during periods of high evaporation.

Figure 7: Application of chemical monolayer at the 120 hectare storage at Cubbie Station, Dirranbandi Qld

With the current price of water, monolayers provide the only economically viable option for large agricultural water storages above ten hectares in size. They are particularly suited as a low risk investment option for owners of agricultural storages that do not have water in them all year and every year.

3. The NRM&W Evaporation Control Project

3.1 Project overview

A research project commissioned by the Rural Water Use Efficiency Initiative (RWUEI) of Queensland Natural Resources, Mines and Water (NRM&W) took place from 2003–2005 to investigate the performance of different types of cover. Outcomes from the project included important new knowledge regarding the field performance of different types of cover, technology to accurately assess evaporation and seepage losses and increased public awareness of the potential for evaporation reduction on water storages. Significant interest has been shown by landholders, agencies and consultancy companies in developing these technologies further.

The seven manufacturers participating in the study are listed below, along with the products that were tested. Contact details for each of the companies can be found in Appendix 1.

1. Nylex Water Solutions – WaterSavr monolayer

2. Evaporation Control Systems – E-VapCap

3. Netpro shadecloth

4. Water Innovations – AquaGuard

5. RMIT/ RioTinto – AquaCap

6. Integrated Packaging – Raftex

7. Ciba Speciality Chemicals – PAM

3.2 Project methodology

Novel experimental methods were developed as part of the project to measure evaporation and seepage by recording water depth to an accuracy of ±1 mm using highly accurate Pressure Sensitive Transducers (Figure 8). PST units were placed at a constant 30 cm height above the dam floor by a float-weight mechanism (Figure 9) and connected to solar powered data loggers (Figure 10).

Figure 8: The Druck 4030 Pressure Sensitive Transducer (PST) unit

Notes: Water balance method using Pressure Sensitive Transducers (PST)

Druck 430 units record water depth to an accuracy of ±0.04% (~ ± 1 mm)

Atmospheric pressure compensated using a breather box system

Based on the electrical resistivity of a micro-machined single silicon crystal

Mounted in a high integrity glass to metal seal, isolated from the pressure media using a Hastelloy diaphragm

Figure 9: PST installation under the water

Figure 10: Data logger, solar panel, battery, power management system and PST air breather system

3.4 Project results

The PST data was compared to weather station derived Penman-Monteith based estimates of evaporation (Figure 11). This enabled evaporation losses to be separated from seepage losses (also a very significant loss of Australian farm water).

Figure 11: Some typical PST water depth data matched against Penman-Monteith prediction of evaporation

The PST methodology confirmed that evaporation loss in small farm dams in Queensland was typically 4–7 mm/day in summer, rising to 10 mm/day when air temperatures exceeded 40 °C. The analysis also revealed that summer night-time evaporation due to heat advection effects could be as much as 10–20 per cent of the total daily evaporation.

The PST analysis technique applied to covered dams revealed evaporation reduction performance figures of approximately 60 to 80% for shadecloth covered dams, approximately 85 to 95% for dams covered with a properly functioning floating cover, and varied from approximately 5 to 30% for dams covered with the cetyl alcohol based chemical monolayer.

The study revealed that high evaporation savings are possible if physical covers are used on small farm dams less than 10 ha in size. Physical covers can still be used on agricultural water storages larger than 10 ha in size, but may prove economically impractical due to the high amount of capital investment required. In the future, increasing costs of agricultural water may make it economical to cover increasingly large sizes of farm dam. Modular covers, for example AquaGuard, Aqua cap and Raftex are presently being evaluated for high value water used in mining or for urban/domestic purposes.

3.5 Future research

Economic analyses have suggested that chemical covers may represent the best option for evaporation control on large agricultural water storages. Future research is planned, commencing in June 2006, with the support of the CRC for Irrigation Futures. The research will focus on developing computer based monitoring technology which will rely on real time computerised infrared visualisation of the chemical coverage on the water surface. This will lead to the development of computerised delivery systems to optimise application across large storages (Figure 12).

Figure 12: Future research is planned to optimise performance of chemical monolayers for agricultural water protection

Fundamental research is planned on the performance of chemical monolayers in terms of their spread, resistance to breakup, and microbial and UV degradation. Preliminary investigations have indicated that the performance of cetyl alcohol based monolayers may be significantly enhanced with the addition of other chemicals, for example, poly vinyl stearate. PVS is a polymer with a comb-like structure which may enhance the resistance of the monolayer to wind stress (Barnes, pers. comm.).

4. Evaporation Assessment Methods

4.1 Dalton formula

At any water/air interface which is above absolute zero, some water molecules leave the water and move into the air. Similarly, some of the water molecules in the air re-enter the water. If the rates of each process are equal, then there is no net movement of water molecules across the interface and therefore no evaporation. If however some water molecules are allowed to disperse upwards, that is, they are effectively removed from the air close to the water surface, then a net transfer of water molecules from water to air takes place and evaporation occurs.

Evaporation of a free water surface is therefore defined as net movement of water molecules from water to air. The rate of evaporation, E (mm/hr), depends on the rate at which the water molecules are dispersed away from the surface. This is a function of wind speed $f(u)$ and the Water Vapour Deficit (WVD). WVD is a function of the temperature and humidity of the air (Figure 13) (WVD=VPD in Figure 13).

Partial pressure, e, (Pa) is a convenient way to express the water vapour content or humidity of air. The humidity of air is a function of temperature and is defined by the saturated vapour pressure (e_{sat} or e_s) curve presented in Figure 13. The gradient of the e_s curve ($\delta e/\delta T$) at any temperature T is defined as Δ_T.

Consider a parcel of air with temperature T and an actual water vapour partial pressure e_a. If the parcel of air is cooled adiabatically (i.e. no transfer of heat), T and e change along a line which has a negative gradient equal to the psychrometric constant, λ. Once the e_s curve is reached, the air is fully saturated. The temperature at which this occurs is known as the wet bulb temperature (T_w). Although λ has an approximate value of 67 Pa C^{-1}, it is not strictly a constant as it is a weak function of both temperature and air pressure.

Relative Humidity (RH) is simply e/e_s expressed as a percentage. Absolute humidity is the concentration of water vapour in air, expressed in ppm or in $\mu g/m^3$. Keeping temperature constant (isothermal), the amount by which water vapour pressure, e (Pa) would have to increase so that the e_s curve was reached (i.e. the air becomes completely saturated) is known as the Vapour Pressure Deficit (VPD). VPD is commonly expressed in formulas as $(e_s - e_a)$.

Figure 13: Principle of evaporation

Where f(u) is a wind speed function, Dalton's formula (alternatively referred to as the 'bulk aerodynamic formula') for potential evaporation, or the aerodynamic drying power of the air, E_a, is expressed as follows:

$$E_a = f(u)(e_s - e_a) \hspace{3cm} 1.$$

Use of the Dalton formula represents the most basic method for estimating evaporation and is useful if meteorological data is poor or limited and if a reliable function for wind speed can be found. Dingham (1994) applied a simple constant to the wind velocity equal to 1.26×10^{-4} (s/mb/day). This is the basis for the SEBAL (Surface Energy Balance Model), by Bastiaanssen and Bandara (2001).

Variations on the Dalton formula, also referred to as the Vapour Pressure Deficit method (Howell & Dusek 1995), or the Bulk Aerodynamic method (Lakshman 1972, Stewart & Rouse 1976, deBruin 1978), have been used in a number of evaporation studies, including the Snowy River Mountain scheme (Australian Water Resources Council 1971, Hoy & Stevens 1977). Estimation of the evaporation from the lake of Aswan High Dam (Lake Nasser, Egypt) using the bulk aerodynamic method was undertaken by Omar & El-Bakry (1981).

4.2 Penman-Monteith method

Combination methods were first introduced by Penman (1948) and account for the energy required to sustain evaporation and the mechanism required to remove the vapour. Penman showed that the rate of evaporation from an open water surface (mm/day) could be expressed as

$$E_o = (\Delta Q + \gamma E_a)/(\Delta + \gamma) \hspace{3cm} 2.$$

where Q is the evaporation equivalent of the net flux of radiant energy to the surface, where the corresponding aerodynamic or ventilation term is

$$E_a = 0.26(e_s - e_a)(1 + U/100) \hspace{3cm} 3.$$

where e_s and e_a are the actual and saturated values of vapour pressure at 2 m above the surface and U is the corresponding wind run, in miles per day. γ is the thermodynamic value of the psychrometric constant, equal to 0.66mb K^{-1} and Δ is the slope of the saturation-vapour pressure versus temperature curve for water at air temperature in mb/°C (Thom and Oliver 1977).

The more commonly used 'general form' of the equation (Kashyap & Panda 2001) is as follows:

$$ET_o = \frac{1}{\lambda}\left[\left(\frac{\Delta}{\Delta+\gamma}\right)(R_n - G) + \left(\frac{\gamma}{\Delta+\gamma}\right)f(u)(e_s - e_a)\right] \hspace{1.5cm} 4.$$

where ET_o is the evaporative flux (mm/day)

λ is latent heat of vaporisation (MJ kg^{-1}) = *2.501-0.002361T (°C)* ≈ *2.45*

R_n is net radiation (MJm^{-2} day^{-1})

G is the soil or water heat flux (MJm^{-2} day^{-1})

Δ is the slope of the svp-t curve (kPaC^{-1}) = *0.2{0.00738T + 0.8072}^{7} – 0.00016*

γ is the psychrometric constant (kPaC^{-1}) = *c_pP/0.622λ* ≈ *0.067*

$f(u)$ is a function of wind speed = 6.43(1+0.0536u_2)

e_s is the saturated vapour pressure (kPa)

e_a is the actual vapour pressure (kPa)

Originally, Penman (1948) proposed the following equation for the wind speed function

$$f(u) = 0.26(1 + 0.54u_2) \hspace{3cm} 5.$$

where u_2 is wind speed in ms^{-1} at 2m above the surface (the constants assume E in mm/day and vapour pressure in mbar). The constant 1 was later altered by Penman (1956) to 0.5, although Thom and Oliver (1977) regarded 1 as preferable. Based on lysimeter measurements, Doorenbos and Pruitt (1975) suggested that 0.54 be altered to 0.86. This highlights the requirement for a single standardized method, such as the one in FAO 56 (Allen et al. 1998).

Alternatively, the Penman (1948) equation is expressed as follows:

$$\lambda E = \frac{\Delta(R_n - G) + \Delta \rho_a c_p (e_s - e)/r_a}{\Delta + \gamma} \qquad \text{6.}$$

$$\text{or } E = (1/\lambda)\frac{\Delta(R_n - G) + \Delta \rho_a c_p (e_s - e)/r_a}{\Delta + \gamma}$$

where r_a is a wind speed dependant aerodynamic resistance term. Monteith (1965) presented a modified version of the Penman equation incorporating a crop surface resistance term. This forms the basis of the Penman-Monteith method (PM) and is

$$\lambda E = \frac{\Delta(R_n - G) + \Delta \rho_a c_p (e_s - e)/r_a}{\Delta + \gamma *} \qquad \text{7.}$$

where ρ_a is the mean air density at constant pressure

c_p is the specific heat of air

$\gamma *$ is a modified psychrometer constant as follows

$$\gamma * = \gamma(1 + r_s / r_a) \qquad \text{8.}$$

where r_s is the surface (or canopy, leaf, stomatal) resistance (s/m) term controlling release of water vapour to the surface

r_a is the aerodynamic (or ventilative) resistance (s/m) term controlling the removal of water vapour away from the surface

The aerodynamic resistance, r_a, which is now the wind speed function term, is defined according to FAO 56 as

$$r_a = \frac{\ln\left[\dfrac{z_m - d}{z_{om}}\right]\ln\left[\dfrac{z_h - d}{z_{oh}}\right]}{k^2 u_2} \qquad \text{9.}$$

where zm is the height of wind measurements (m)
zh is the height of humidity measurements (m)
d is the zero plane displacement height (m)
zom is the roughness length governing momentum transfer (m)
zoh is the roughness length governing transfer of heat and vapour (m)
k is the von Karmon constant = 0.41
u_2 is the wind speed at height 2m (ms^{-1})

The (bulk) surface resistance, r_s, is defined as

$$r_s = r_{stom} / LAI_{active} \qquad \text{10.}$$

According to FAO 56, the method has been developed from the Penman-Monteith Equation by Allen et al. (1998). A reference crop is used consisting of watered mown grass 0.12m high, r_a

is assigned a value of $208/u_2$ s/m and r_s is assigned a value of 70 s/m. Assuming an albedo of 0.23 then leads to the FAO 56 formula for reference transpiration *ET0* (mm/day). The evapotranspiration of a particular crop *ETc* is then related to *ET0* as follows

$$ET_c = K_c ET_o \qquad\qquad 11.$$

The present study deals with evaporation from a free water surface. A value of 0 for r_s can therefore be assumed with the result that the FAO 56 equation can revert back to the original Penman (1948) equation for a free water surface.

FAO 56 Calculations

$$ET_0 = \frac{0.408\Delta(R_n - G) + \gamma\dfrac{900}{T + 273}u_2(e_s - e_a)}{\Delta + \gamma(1 + 0.34u_2)} \qquad\qquad 12.$$

$$\Delta = \frac{4098\left[0.6108\exp\left(\dfrac{17.27T}{T + 237.3}\right)\right]}{(T + 237.3)^2} \qquad\qquad 13.$$

$$\gamma = \frac{c_p P}{\varepsilon\lambda} = 0.067 \qquad\qquad 14.$$

$$P = 101.3\left(\frac{293 - 0.0065z}{293}\right)^{5.26} \qquad\qquad 15.$$

$$e_s = 0.6108\exp\left[\frac{17.27T}{T + 237.3}\right] \qquad\qquad 16$$

$$e_a = \frac{\overline{RH}.e_s}{100} \qquad\qquad 17.$$

$$R_n = (1 - \alpha)R_s - R_l \qquad\qquad 18.$$

$$R_s = \{a + b(n/N)\}R_a \qquad\qquad 19.$$

$$R_l = \sigma\overline{T^4}(0.34 - 0.14\sqrt{e_a})(1.35R_s/R_{so} - 0.35) \qquad\qquad 20.$$

ET_0	reference transpiration (mm/day)
Δ	slope of the saturated vapour pressure temperature curve where T is air temperature (°C)
R_n	net radiation (MJ/m^2/day)
G	soil heat flux (MJ/m^2/day)
γ	psychrometric constant 0.067 (kPa°C^{-1})
u_2	wind speed at 2m height (m/s)
c_p	specific heat at constant pressure 1.013 x 10-3 (MJ kg^{-1} °C^{-1})
P	atmospheric pressure 101.3 (kPa) where z is elevation above sea level (m)
ε	ratio of the molecular weight of water vapour / dry air 0.622
λ	latent heat of vaporisation, 2.45 (MJ kg^{-1}) (1/2.45 = 0.408)
e_s	saturated vapour pressure (kPa)

e_a — actual vapour pressure (kPa) where RH is the relative humidity (from AWS)

α — surface albedo (assumed 0.23)

R_s — total radiation from AWS, or calculated from eqn 19, where a= 0.25, b= 0.5, n is actual duration of sunshine hours, N is maximum possible duration of sunshine hours (for clear skies n=N and $R_s = R_{so}$) and R_a is the average daily extraterrestrial solar radiation (from tables)

R_l — long wave radiation (MJ/m^2/day) where σ is Stefan-Boltzmann constant = 4.903 MJ/m^2/K^4/day

There have been several recent studies (Ventura et al. 1999, Hussein 1999, Al-Ghobari 2000, Kashyap & Panda 2001, George et al. 2002) that have confirmed that the FAO 56 Penman-Monteith (PM) equation generally out performs other equations, for example Blaney-Criddle (1945), Turc (1961), Jensen-Haise (1963), Priestly-Taylor (1972), Doorenbos-Pruitt (1975), Hargreaves & Samani (1985), Shuttleworth-Wallace (1985), Watts-Hancock (1984) etc. The general consensus is therefore that the PM method is superior to all the other ET methods. Kashyap and Panda (2001) have clearly indicated this in their study comparing 10 ET methods to grassed weighing lysimeter data obtained in India (Table 1).

Table 1: Ranking of ETo estimation methods based on root mean square error (RMSE) (after Kashyap and Panda 2001)

Rank	Estimation method	Mean deviation from measured values (%)	Coefficient of determination (R^2)	RMSE (mm per day)
1	Penman-Monteith	-1.36	0.91	0.080
2	Kimberly-Penman	-1.51	0.74	0.211
3	FAO-Penman	-3.60	0.76	0.234
4	Turc-Radiation	+2.72	0.70	0.260
5	Blaney-Criddle	+3.16	0.72	0.289
6	Preistley-Taylor	-6.28	0.77	0.316
7	Penman	+11.87	0.78	0.317
8	Hargreaves	+8.34	0.70	0.358
9	FAO-Radiation	+17.89	0.75	0.540
10	Corrected Penman	+22.32	0.81	0.756

(1) Blainey-Criddle based on mean air temperature only
(2) Priestly-Taylor based on net radiation and temperature

The PM method has two distinct advantages over the other methods. Firstly, it has a physical basis implying the equation can be used globally without the need for empirically derived constants relevant to specific regions. Secondly, the equation has received the most thorough experimental validation against other methods, mainly weighing lysimeters and soil moisture measurements. A disadvantage of the PM method however is the relatively high data requirement including air temperature, wind speed, relative humidity and solar radiation, although Allen (1996) pointed out alternative ways of estimating solar radiation and humidity using simpler or fewer measurements.

Table 2: Error analysis of the PM equation. Variation in input parameter required to produce ±2σ (95% confidence interval) variation in the PM ETo prediction (after Droogers and Allen 2002)

Parameter	Variation required
Radiation	± 25%
Wind speed	± 25%
Temperature	± 5% (~±1°C)
Humidity	± 25%

4.3 Water balance

The mass flow balance of a dam or water storage over a specified time interval may be expressed as

$$Q_{in} + P + \delta D = Q_{out} + S + E \qquad\qquad 21.$$

where Q_{in} is the inflow, P is precipitation, δD is the change in level, Q_{out} is the outflow, S is seepage and E is the evaporation rate, all in mm day^{-1}.

Water balance studies more commonly calculate evaporation so that seepage can be deduced. A recent study has been carried out at Lake Powell, Glen Canyon dam, Arizona (Myers 1999). Evaporation of effluent ponds has been reviewed by Louden and Reece (1983) and more recently addressed by Ham and DeSutter (1999) and Glanville et al. (1999).

The change in the water level of the dam can either be measured using pressure transducer based depth sensors, or siphon weighing systems (Glanville et al. 1999). Inflow and outflow to the storage, in addition to seepage, have to be determined very accurately in order to obtain a meaningful evaporation estimation. The aim of this type of experimental approach is illustrated in Figure 14.

Figure 14: Principle of physical measurement of evaporation of a water storage using flow mass balance method

The main challenge is to determine seepage accurately. As part of the NRM&W study, which was to evaluate the effect of various covers in reducing evaporation, three lined tanks were installed with no seepage. With other water storages, depending on the quality of the liner, there is usually some loss due to seepage. The best method to determine the seepage rate is to accurately measure the change in water level overnight, when there should be minimal evaporative loss. This necessitates the use of very accurate transducers (accurate to ± 1 mm

day^{-1} or better). Waste level recorders were rigorously tested by Ham and DeSutter (1999) and found to be extremely accurate and stable (e.g. ± 0.16 mm).

Wind speed effects can be a cause of variability in evaporation rate data (Glanville et al. 1999). For example, wind induced waves superimpose a signal noise on depth measurements which has to be carefully removed. More seriously, wind can effectively pile up water along the downwind shoreline of a water body. Sample calculations using the approach of White and Denmead (1989) indicated that depth errors caused by wind drag would be less than 1 mm. There is also the tidal effect which may be a few mm for large water bodies.

4.4 Evaporation pans

Evaporation pans have been, and still are, used extensively throughout the world to estimate reference evapotranspiration for crop surfaces, or evaporation from a bare soil or water surface (Kadel & Abbe 1916). Evaporation pans (Class A pan, USDA or US Weather Bureau) consist of a circular pan, generally four feet in diameter and 10 inches deep. They should be mounted on a slatted timber base on level short mown grass and equipped with a bird guard (Figure 15).

Figure 15: Typical evaporation pan with weeds and no bird guard. The pan is also not filled to the top so there will be significant errors associated with the aerodynamics of the lip

A floating evaporation pan setup has been described by Ham (1999). According to Burman & Pochop (1994) differences between water body and pan conditions that can affect pan data include:

1. differing water temperature variations with depth
2. storage of heat within the pan
3. differences in wind exposure
4. differences in the turbulence, temperature and humidity of air above the water surface
5. heat transfer through the sides and bottom of the pan.

Since pan evaporation (*Epan*) normally exceeds evaporative losses from larger water bodies (*Ews*), researchers commonly adjust the pan data as follows:

$$E_{ws} = E_{pan} . K_{pan} \qquad\qquad 22.$$

where *Kpan* is a pan coefficient which generally varies from about 0.6 to 0.9 (Brutsaert 1982) or 0.6–1.2 (Clewitt 1980) depending on the pan and the surrounding environment. Calculation of pan coefficients for pans across Queensland was carried out by Weeks (1983) who concluded 0.7 to 1.0 was typical.

In his famous book *Evaporation into the atmosphere*, Brutseart (1982) describes evaporation pans in terms of 'uncertain and often dubious applicability as a measure of evaporation in nature'. Watts and Hancock (1984) reaffirm Brutsaert's statement and assert that all evaporation pan data should be regarded as 'untrustworthy'. The authors list the problems associated with operating pans as follows:

1. dirt on the metal pan

2. contamination of the water

3. other inputs (rain, splash-in)

4. other outputs (bird and animal drinking, splash-out)

5. ventilation changes below pan (change of grass length)

6. thermal property variations

7. presence of birdguard (reduction of both radiation input and ventilation)

8. possible shade at low sun angles (e.g. surrounding trees)

9. wave action and overtopping in windy conditions

10. surface tension problems when refilling to needle point

Even with properly maintained pans the energy exchange, heat storage and airflow characteristics for the shallow water in the pan are likely to be very different to that of open water or a crop. However, a number of studies (Doorenbos & Pruitt 1975) have demonstrated that pans can work well when properly maintained. Pans may work well if evaporative conditions are not too severe. An evaluation of Class A Pan coefficients in humid locations has been carried out by Irmak et al. 2002. The problem of heat conduction in evaporation pans has been addressed by Oroud (1998).

hot dry air from area immediately upwind of pan causes increased evaporation here

pooling of warm water due to wind drag causes increased evaporation here

Figure 16: Aerodynamic lip / advective effects associated with evaporation pans

Many problems associated with small pans can be eliminated if the size of the pan is increased. At University of Southern Queensland (USQ), trials with very large pans or tanks are taking place. With these pans, the height of the lip is small compared to the overall width of the pan, so lip errors are significantly reduced. However, these pans still suffer from the problem of

fouling by wildlife. At USQ, fouling by ducks was initially quite a problem and bird scarers had to be installed at the facility.

Figure 17: Evaporation Research Facility based at NCEA, USQ. The experimental trial consists of three lined 10 m x 0.8 m deep tanks which are being used to accurately assess the effectiveness of different evaporation control methods.

4.5 Bowen Ratio energy balance

Net radiation (R_n) is either absorbed as ground heat flux (G) or transferred to the air above in the form of sensible heat flux (H) and latent heat flux (λH). The latter is defined as the energy expended in converting liquid water into water vapour. Thus, the heat energy balance may be expressed as follows:

$$R_n - G - H - \lambda E = 0 \qquad\qquad 23.$$

This may be rearranged as follows:

$$\lambda E = \frac{R_n - G}{1 + \beta} \qquad\qquad 24.$$

where β is the Bowen Ratio, that is, the ratio of sensible to latent heat flux (Bowen 1926). Bowen used this ratio to estimate evaporation. Equation 25 is most accurate when β is small (Brutseart 1982). β is measured experimentally using Bowen Ratio apparatus which determines the temperature and humidity gradients over a height interval δz.

$$\beta = \frac{H}{\lambda E} = \lambda\left(\frac{\partial T}{\partial e}\right) = \gamma \frac{K_h}{K_e}\left(\frac{\partial T/\partial z}{\partial e/\partial z}\right) \qquad\qquad 25.$$

Bowen Ratio apparatus is required to accurately measure small differences in temperature and humidity over a small height interval above the evaporating surface. Traditionally, the equipment features a net radiometer and a pair of rotating precision aspirating psychrometers (Hancock, pers comm.).

The net radiometer, for example Funk type (Funk 1959, 1962), consists of a thermopile (series of thermocouple junctions) between an upper and lower blackened surface. The temperature difference between the two surfaces is a function of the net radiation (i.e. the difference between incoming and ground reflected radiation). The unit is enclosed within a polythene dome fed with a slight positive pressure of dry nitrogen to ensure no ingress of moisture.

The two rotating psychrometers (each consisting of wet and dry bulb thermometers located inside white cylindrical radiation shields) are mounted on a motor driven interchange system so that their heights are automatically alternated after each pair of measurements. This provides both the temperature and humidity gradient information with successive readings being averaged to cancel out any small calibration differences between the two psychrometers.

An even more accurate approach to measuring Bowen Ratio is to use a Cooled Mirror Hygrometer (CMH). Usually, there is only one CMH unit and air is ducted from the high and low sample positions alternately. The air sample is passed over a mirror which is cooled using a liquid nitrogen supply. The temperature at which dew first starts to form on the mirror (detected using an infra red beam) is a function of the original humidity of the air sample.

Figure 18: Rotating Arm (paired aspirating psychrometers) and Alternate Flow (cooled mirror hygrometer) units used in accurate Bowen Ratio measurements

Due to expense and maintenance difficulties in these early approaches, later Bowen Ratio systems have moved to solid state temperature and humidity measurement consisting of Al/Si oxide porous material (usually ceramic), polymer film, or carbon coated plate alternatives. Temperature and relative humidity (RH) are calculated directly from changes in the electrical properties of the material (capacitance, resistance, impedance). These systems are cheap, robust and reliable, but struggle to be accurate enough for precise Bowen Ratio work. Their use is intended for the main market, which comprises mostly of standard meteorological stations. Reviews of the various humidity measurement techniques have been conducted by Scott (1996) and Wielderhold (1997).

Bowen ratio methods have been extensively used to measure biosphere-atmosphere exchange methods as part of the OASIS program (Leuning et al. 2004, Raupach et al. 2003) and as part of the FLUXNET program (Wilson et al. 2002). An evaluation of the Bowen Ratio method for Australian conditions was carried out by Angus and Watts (1984). Other Australian studies include McIlroy (1972) and McLeod et al. (1998).

Some of the problems associated with the BREB method (i.e. in obtaining balance or 'closure') have been investigated by Brotzge and Crawford (2002). A full error analysis of the Bowen Ratio method has been performed by Watts (1983). This highlighted that there are quite large errors in very dry conditions (i.e. large B). For a freely evaporating surface ($-0.2 < B < +0.2$) there can be errors of up to 30 per cent in B which lead to errors in λE of less than 5 per cent.

4.6 Eddy Correlation

The measurement of vertical transfer of heat and water vapour by eddies was first described by Swinbank (1951). Since then, micrometeorologists have long held that eddy correlation techniques offer the most promise for providing accurate measurements of evaporative flux with a sound theoretical basis (Kaimal & Gaynor 1991). The method is offering an attractive alternative to other more cumbersome methods such as weighing lysimeters and Bowen Ratio. A comprehensive manual invaluable to the experimental practitioner of the method is provided by van Dijk (2003).

The major challenge associated with the Eddy Correlation method is the response time limitations of the sensor instrumentation. Developments in electronics in recent years have resulted in new sensors with the required speed and accuracy (see Table 3 and Figure 19).

Table 3: Components of a typical Eddy Correlation system

Sensor	Parameter	Example
3 axis sonic anenometer	wind speed $(u \pm u', v \pm v', w \pm w')$	CSAT3§
IR/UV absorption hygrometer	specific humidity $(q \pm q')$	LiCor§, Krypton§ KH20
Fine wire thermocouple	temperature $(t \pm t')$	13 micron

§ available from Campbell Scientific Pty Ltd

Eddy correlation theory describes the turbulent transport properties such as momentum flux, sensible heat flux and latent heat flux. The method relies on accurately measuring the fluctuations in airspeed, temperature and humidity.

Considering motion in the vertical direction (w), the latent heat flux is defined by

$$\lambda E = \rho \lambda w q \qquad\qquad 26.$$

where λE is the instantaneous latent heat flux (W/m^{-2})
     ρ is the instantaneous air density
     λ is the instantaneous latent heat of vaporisation of water (J/g)
     q is the instantaneous specific humidity (g/g)

λE can be converted to water vapour flux by dividing by λ, and then to a conventional evaporation rate by dividing by the density of water.

Each component in the equation can be partitioned into a mean value plus an instantaneous deviation from the mean. The instantaneous deviations of air density and latent heat of vaporisation can be assumed to be zero. The long-term mean vertical wind velocity over a flat uniform surface can be assumed to have a value of zero (Dyer, 1961). Applying these assumptions and the rules of statistical averaging, the mean vertical flux for an averaging period longer than a few seconds becomes

$$\overline{\lambda E} = \rho \lambda \overline{w' q'} \qquad\qquad 27.$$

where $\overline{w' q'}$ is defined as the covariance of vertical wind speed and specific humidity. Thus, over a level, uniform surface, the latent heat is entirely due to eddy transport, with no contribution from mean vertical flow.

A similar analysis can be applied to the sensible heat flux, yielding

$$\overline{H} = \rho C_p \overline{w'T'} \qquad\qquad 28.$$

where $\quad\overline{H}$ is the mean sensible heat flux (W/m^2)

C_p is the specific heat of air (J/kg^{-1}K^{-1})

$\overline{w'T'}$ is the covariance of vertical airspeed and temperature (Kms^{-1})

Fine wire thermocouples are usually used for the fast response temperature measurement.

Figure 19: Typical eddy correlation equipment including 3 axis sonic anemometer and LiCor (IR) or KH20 (UV) based fast response humidity sensors (pictures are courtesy of Campbell Scientific Australia)

Figure 20: Principle of operation of Eddy Correlation system. The humidity (concentration of water molecules) of upward verses downward moving air is compared to give the humidity flux

Absorption hygrometers utilise either infrared radiation (Staats et al. 1965), Lyman-alpha radiation (Randall et al. 1965, Miyake & McBean 1970, Buck 1976, Redford et al. 1980), or the krypton UV radiation method (Campbell & Tanner 1985). An Infra Red fluctuation hygrometry method was described in Raupach (1978).

The LiCor open path unit features an IR beam which is chopped using a grating rotating at 9000 RPM. Detection of water vapour is via absorbance at 2.59 µm using a Pb-Se detector. Advantages reported for the krypton hygrometer are a more stable calibration and longer radiation tube life.

4.7 Area based methods

Other methods of investigating evaporation of water bodies include the following:

1. Satellite remote sensing. This uses information in the Infra Red sensitive to ground moisture content and has been used extensively for catchment evaporation evaluations (Bastiaanssen & Bandara 2001). The recession of the shores of Lake Eyre drying up after a flood has been carefully mapped over time using satellite data (Prata 1990.), but seepage, rainfall, and in/out flows were neglected.

2. Low level airborne survey. This took place over Lake Alexandrina (Kotwicki 1994). Measurement of sensible and latent heat fluxes were carried out using a GROB G109B research aircraft flying at 5–10 m height above water surface. Evaporation from the lake was determined to be about 1 m/year. Another airborne hygrometry study was described by Silver and Hovde (1998).

3. Microwave radar. This has been carried out by CSIRO, Australia and is described by Hill and Long (1995).

4. Large Aperture Scintillometry (LAS). This method is based on the analysis of intensity fluctuations (known as scintillations) of a near infrared (0.94 µm) light beam (Gieske & Meijninger 2003).

5. LIDAR (UV laser based scanning radar). Originally developed by the US military, this is now a standard research instrument at several institutions (e.g. University of California Davis, Munich, Iowa, and the Los Alamos Laboratory). LIDAR consists of a pulsed UV laser with Raman backscatter at 273 nm. A 1 km range, 1 m resolution and 95 per cent accuracy is claimed

Figure 21: Truck transportable LIDAR machine. The technology uses a scanning UV laser to detect humidity fields and thus deduce total evaporation rates over water bodies

Figure 22: Typical output data from the LIDAR unit

4.8 Accounting for advective energy

In hot climates, advection plays a very important role in evaporation of water storages and therefore cannot be ignored. Hot dry cells, or thermals, form as a result of air passing over hot dry land. Inside the cells, the temperature may exceed 40 °C and humidity may approach zero. As these cells pass over water, extra energy is provided to locally increase evaporation rates at the upwind margin of the water body. This has the effect of depressing the mean humidity contours at the upwind margin of a water body (Figure 23).

Figure 23: Principle of added evaporation energy due to the oasis effect. Relative Humidity contours predicted by the model of Webster and Sherman (1995) are depressed at the upwind margin of the water body, due to advection of hot dry air from an adjacent land mass.

For most evaporation measurements, the fetch (area upwind of point of measurement with similar surface characteristics) must be sufficiently long to develop a constant flux layer. This happens at some distance downwind from the upwind margin of a water body where equilibrium conditions are reached, that is, temperature and humidity profiles do not change significantly as one progresses further downwind across the water body. Some argument exists as to the minimum length of this fetch. Slatyer and McIlroy (1961) recommend an instrument height to fetch ratio of 1:100. This means that if the instrument measuring evaporation is set at a height of 1 m above the water surface, then it should be situated at least 100 m downwind from the bank of the water body. The problems with measuring evaporation using Penman-Monteith for water bodies less than a few hundred metres across is therefore highlighted.

Figure 24: Simplified representation of local advection (after Oke 1987)

For small water storages (less than a few hundred metres across), advective effects are taking place across the whole of the water storage. Temperature, humidity, wind speed and therefore evaporation will all vary second by second. Hourly or per minute meteorological data is therefore of little use in this situation. To truly estimate evaporation over small water storages in hot climates, we therefore require meteorological data with millisecond resolution. The Eddy Correlation method is able to provide this temporal resolution. Additionally, air stability will vary markedly through the day in hot climates and this has an important effect on evaporation. The Eddy Correlation technique is able to calculate stability directly from the 3 axis wind direction and speed information gained from the sonic anemometer component of the apparatus. However, Eddy Correlation is still only a point measurement. Laser and remote sensing methods are really required to measure the spatial variability of humidity fields to fully take account of advective effects.

Under most climates that have sufficient rainfall to support ET, λE is generally some fraction of net radiation R_n. However, in areas where the air mass is strongly modified by dry desert conditions, the ratio of λE to R_n can exceed 1.5 (Allen 1999). In the case of an oasis in a desert environment, hot dry air moving sideways in the form of major eddies provides a major input of extra energy into the system (Webster & Sherman 1995, Condie & Webster 1997, Brutsaert & Stricker 1979, Brutsaert 1982). Where A_d is the extra energy due to advection, the sum of energies is now

$$R_n + A_d - G - H - \lambda E = 0 \qquad\qquad 29.$$

With fast response meteorological data, the Penman approach could still be used to calculate evaporation for rapidly fluctuating conditions. To remind us once more, the Penman Equation may be expressed as

$$\lambda E = \frac{\Delta R_n}{\Delta + \gamma} + \frac{\gamma E_a}{\Delta + \gamma} \qquad\qquad 30.$$

The first term is usually referred to as the radiation term and the second term the ventilative, aerodynamic or convection term. Brutsaert (1982) however prefers to call the first term the equilibrium term and the second term the non-equilibrium term, or the drying power of the air arising from large scale advection.

Consider a boundary layer (i.e. air in close contact with the water) which is completely uniform and saturated. The second term of Equation 30 is zero, but there is still some evaporation because of the first 'radiation' term which represents the lower limit of evaporation from moist surfaces. The radiation term may be thought of informally as incoming photons knocking water molecules out of the surface of the water, which then knock other water molecules out of the boundary layer into the air above. More formally, the first term is considered as representing evaporation under equilibrium conditions, and the second term, the evaporation arising as a result of the departure from equilibrium conditions, that is, advection (Brutseart & Stricker 1979).

Figure 25: Concept of equilibrium and homogeneity associated with local scale advection

The atmospheric boundary layer however is almost never uniform but unsteady which tends to maintain a humidity deficit, even over the oceans. True equilibrium conditions are probably never encountered. Over a number natural surfaces described as saturated and essentially advection free, Priestley and Taylor (1972) noted that departure from equilibrium conditions produced evaporation values approximately 1.26–1.28 times greater than that predicted by the radiation term alone. This data was also supported by Davies and Allen (1973), Thompson (1975), and Stewart and Rouse (1976). It is notable that land surfaces covered with vegetation, which is not wet but has ample water available, yield roughly the same evaporation as free water surfaces. This may be due to the larger roughness of the vegetative surface compared to the water surface. This is not true for wet canopy surfaces which are capable of evaporating at much greater rates (Watts & Hancock 1984). This also may not be true in hot, dry, windy conditions experienced over water bodies in arid climates where waves on the surface of the water will increase roughness length of the surface.

4.9 Summary of methods

A summary of the advantages and disadvantages of the various methods and their appropriateness to the present study is presented in the following table.

Table 4: Advantages and disadvantages of the various assessment methods

Method	Brief description	Advantages	Disadvantages	Appropriateness to present study
Pan (Class A)	Simple pan of water, refill rate is a measure of the evaporation rate. Related to crop ET via a simple 'Pan'	Simple and robust. Pan factors have been widely used/accepted for irrigation scheduling purposes	Difficult to keep clean and maintain, can give erroneous data, water/pan can heat up, complex wind speed effects associated with lip	Simple, easy to operate and maintain during short term trial. The three lined tanks (USQ) may be considered as well maintained large pans

	factor			
Penman-Monteith (FAO 56)	Accepted standard method for estimating evaporation from standard (single height) meteorological data.	FAO 56 now widely established and used. FAO 56 considered superior to other ET formulae, for example Blaney-Criddle (1945), Priestly-Taylor (1972)	Few disadvantages, except not as accurate as Bowen Ratio or Eddy Correlation.	Very appropriate to present study. FAO 56 PM will be calculated using data from AWS. May require acquisition of accurate net radiation sensors.
Bowen Ratio (BR)	Measures temperature and humidity gradient across two heights close to evaporating surface.	Well established and can be very accurate if set up correctly with accurate sensors.	Humidity sensors of the required accuracy, for example, cooled mirror hygrometer very expensive. Equipment can be temperamental.	Not appropriate as equipment impossible to acquire and set within time frame of project. Also, superseded by EC
Eddy Correlation (EC)	Uses 3 axis sonic anemometry and fast response infra-red sensors to detect the difference in upward versus downward moving air.	Now a well established, affordable, up to date technique for evaporation assessment. Particularly suited to measurements close to open water surfaces.	Equipment still a little expensive for routine farm use, but affordable for researchers with a reasonable budget	Would be very appropriate for this study. The only method which is accurate in fetch limited situations (most farm storages)
Ground based laser	e.g. Tunable Diode Fourier Transform InfraRed (FTIR), LIDAR (UV), Microwave Radiometry (CSIRO). Range about 1 km, resolution about 1 m, about ± 5 % accuracy claimed	Lasers can scan horizontally and through the humidity plume. Widely used in vulcanology. Can map variability of water vapour concentration across a water surface thus assessing fetch /advective effects.	Laser methods need the support of a well resourced university physics department. LIDAR type methods rather expensive. Only suited to large scale research projects.	Would be nice, but an expensive and possibly time/effort consuming option for this study
Remote sensing/airborne survey	Spectral/thermal information obtained using aircraft or satellites	Good at assessing water surface temperature across large water bodies several km across.	Not so good at directly assessing evaporative flux from a water body	Would be nice, but an expensive and possibly time/effort consuming option for this study.

5. Summary

Evaporation losses from on-farm storage can potentially be large, particularly in irrigation areas in northern New South Wales and Queensland where an estimated 40 per cent of storage volume can be lost each year to evaporation. Reducing evaporation from a water-storage would allow additional crop production, water trading or release of water for the environment. The NCEA study undertook a practical evaluation of current evaporation mitigation technologies (EMTs) on commercial sized water storages. In the case of the Australian arid/semi-arid pastoral industry, EMTs may be impractical at present due to cost and difficulty of implementation. It follows that any recommendation regarding water use efficiency might entail avoiding the storage of water in surface dams where possible, and pumping water directly from bores only when required. In this way, excessive losses of water due to evaporation could be effectively minimised.

The Evaporation Control Project referred to in this review was initiated by the Queensland Government Department of Natural Resources and Mines (NRM) with the express aim of addressing this gap in our knowledge. It focused on:

- assessment of the effectiveness of different EMTs in reducing evaporation from commercial storages across a range of climate regions
- assessment of the practical and technical limitations of different evaporation control products
- comparison of the economics of different EMTs on water storages used for irrigation
- preliminary assessment of the effect on water quality of the various EMTs.

This project largely met all of its objectives, and resulted in:

- detailed investigation of the evaporation mitigation efficiency of five products Water$avr (monolayer), E-VapCap (floating cover), NetPro shade cloth (suspended cover), Raftex (modular cover) and Polyacrylamide (chemical) on research tanks located at the University of Southern Queensland (USQ), Toowoomba.
- field demonstrations and evaluations of evaporation reduction efficiency at four commercial storages (Capella (Water$avr), Dirranbandi (Water$avr), St George (E-VapCap) and Stanthorpe (NetPro shade cloth)
- assessment of the mechanical durability, and practical and technical limitations, of the products evaluated at commercial storages
- an economic assessment of the EMTs for a range of climate regimes, based on capital and operating costs and the anticipated evaporation reduction performance
- an initial assessment of potential impact of each product on water quality.
- substantial and significant interaction with agency representatives, farmers and EMT suppliers resulting in much interest in, and support for the adoption of evaporation control products.

A major outcome of the project was increased awareness of the potential for evaporation reduction on water storages. The project has been highly successful in this regard, with significant interest being shown by landholders, agencies and private companies in the work undertaken. The combination of detailed experimentation at USQ, commercial scale demonstration sites and wide publicity, through field days, workshops, scientific papers and popular articles, has raised expectations on the potential for cost effective evaporation control solutions. Already a number of private companies, product suppliers and agency funding bodies are exploring the possibilities for further research, product development and commercialisation in this area.

An important outcome of the project has been the development of methodologies which allow the accurate measurement of seepage and evaporation rates, both from open water storages and

storages with an EMT product in place. The methodology utilised accurate pressure sensors linked to data loggers and automatic weather stations. While further development and testing of this methodology is required, already a number of private irrigation consultants are investigating the use of this technology to provide recommendations to farmers on improved evaporation and seepage management.

Table 5 indicates the range in measured evaporation reduction at the USQ research tanks for the products tested commercially. While efficiency in reducing evaporation was less favourable at commercial test sites, potential savings on commercial storages have also been given, based on the results and experiences of this study. A range of expected installation and operating/maintenance costs are also given and this has been translated into an estimated breakeven cost ($/ML water saved). It is anticipated that the low cost operating and maintenance scenario is most representative given good product installation and management.

Table 5: Summary table on product performance

Product	Evaporation Reduction (%)		Installation Cost ($/m²)	Operating & Maintenance Cost $/ha/year	Breakeven Cost ($/ML saved)
	Measured Small Tanks	Potential Commercial Storage			
		High – Med – Low	Low – High	Low – High	Low – Med – High
E-VapCap	100% – 94%	95% – 90% – 85%	$5.50 – $8.50	$112 – $572	$302 – $319 – $338
NetPro	71% – 69%	80% – 70% – 60%	$7.00 – $10.00	$112 – $537	$296 – $339 – $395
Water$avr	40% – 10%	30% – 15% – 5%	$0.00 –$0.38	$826 – $4,050	$130 – $397 – $1 191

1) Estimated breakeven cost is based on 2200mm potential evaporation, all year water storage, low cost scenario and range in evaporation reduction performance (Low- Med- High).

2) High operating and maintenance costs represent <u>worst case scenario</u> and are unlikely in most cases.

3) Evaporation reduction performance of Water$avr product has been shown to be highly variable and in some trials 0%.

Breakeven cost is shown to vary from $130–$1 191 depending on product and evaporation reduction performance. Under situations where potential evaporation losses from storage exceed 2 000 mm/year and assuming 'medium' evaporation reduction performance the breakeven cost is likely to range from $300/ML to $400/ML saved. The cost per ML water saved is influenced by the amount of time the storage holds water. Chemical monolayers can be selectively applied only in hot months or when there is water in storage which reduces cost per ML water saved. Considering the gross margin per ML water used on many crops ($100–1 000/ML), it is likely that investment in these products will be viable in many situations. Investment in EMTs would also appear to be viable for high value crops in southern areas.

This project did not intend to recommend a single best evaporation control solution and it is envisaged that various EMTs would be appropriate in different situations, depending on the surface area, location and storage operational requirements. For example, floating covers are most appropriate on storages less than 1ha in size with all year water storage. Shade cloth structures would also be most viable on storages with permanent water and are likely to be limited to less than 5 ha in size. Chemical monolayers would be most viable on large storages (greater than 10 ha) and where the dam is likely to be dry for significant periods. Modular systems are likely to be best suited to intermediate storage areas less than 10 ha.

While the volume of water in Queensland farm storages is not accurately known, one estimate from NRM&W (2 500 000 ML) would equate to some 55 000 ha of storage. With appropriate selection of different EMT products for specific storage area and some assumptions on storage size distribution, potentially 300 000 ML of evaporation loss could be saved (with 100 per cent adoption of EMTs). Even 10 per cent adoption would save a significant amount of water (30

000 ML). Only a preliminary water quality assessment was undertaken in this project and no significant negative impacts were evident. Reduced light penetration and lower temperatures occur under floating and shade cloth covers and dissolved oxygen is lower under floating covers. These factors will limit algal growth but may also have an impact on other flora/fauna. The monolayer did not have any negative impact on the physical water quality parameters measured, although a more comprehensive analysis would be required before this product can be widely accepted.

Given the large interest raised by this project further work will be required, particularly in the following areas:

- fundamental research on evaporation processes for storage dams accounting for thermal storage in the water body and advection from surrounds, leading to improved prediction of evaporation losses from weather data and storage characteristics
- further testing of the instrumentation developed in this project for seepage and evaporation determination and methodologies to separate seepage and evaporation components of water loss
- further development of depth sounder systems developed at USQ for storage basin mapping to provide a cheap and accurate system for mapping the storage basin when filled with water
- information on the extent and areal categories of storages in each state leading to information on likely water savings from EMTs
- fundamental research on the potential for use of monolayers, particularly in terms of distribution characteristics, application methods, evaporation reduction performance and environmental impact
- further large scale testing of commercial products, to assess evaporation mitigation efficiency and mechanical durability (in conjunction with suppliers)
- support for quality control, collation and analysis of data being collected commercially by a number of irrigation consultants to facilitate better understanding of factors impacting seepage rates and regional evaporation losses from storage
- extension and communication of results to a wide range of irrigators and stakeholders to ensure the current high level of interest is maintained.

The current interest by EMT product suppliers, landholders and operators in the agricultural, mining and municipal sectors needs to be supported by continued widespread publicity of the potential for evaporation water savings and cost/benefit of water savings.

A number of areas for further research and investment were identified in the report. One of these was the development of a computer model (*Ready Reckoner*) which allows site specific assessment of evaporation mitigation systems, whether it be a cover over the water, applying a chemical monolayer or modifying the shape of the storage dam. The *Ready Reckoner* calculator (Heinrich & Schmidt 2006) is a model which performs a simple, site-specific economic assessment of the viability of evaporation mitigation systems. The user enters appropriate data to customise the software to their particular site. The calculator then returns the volume of water saved (in ML) and the cost of the evaporation mitigation system used to save this water ($/ML/year).

The *Ready Reckoner* requires a number of inputs from the user to evaluate evaporation mitigation systems for their particular storage. The inputs are grouped into six fields: storage type and geometry, evaporation, average amount of water stored per month, average percentage of years that the storage contains water, seepage information and evaporation mitigation system information.

To demonstrate the Ready Reckoner, a 1 hectare square ring tank (100 m x 100 m) was assessed in three locations using three of the products available. The first site is Dubbo in New

South Wales (32.25 S 148.61 E) using the E-Vap Cap floating plastic cover. The results summary below is based on a number of assumptions including:

- the storage always has water in it

- the storage is constructed on clay soils

- all batters are 3:1 and the wall height is 3 m

- the annual evaporation is 2024 mm/year

- the installation cost is $15.00/m2

- the evaporation saving efficiency of the cover is 95 per cent.

DUBBO Square Ring Tank		
Evaporation Mitigation System Used:	Impermeable Cover	
Water Saved From Evaporation	18.2	ML each year
Cost to Save this Water	$963	per ML per year
Calculated Storage Volume at Full Supply Level	25.1	ML
Surface Area at Full Supply Level	1.00	ha
Total Cost of Evaporation Mitigation System at Installation	$150,000	
Annual Operating and Maintenance Cost	$200	

Using a chemical cover on the same storage will have a much lower capital investment but a larger ongoing cost because the chemical product needs to be applied at least twice a week. The product is also much less efficient at saving evaporation but need only be applied during periods of high evaporation and only when there is water in the storage.

DUBBO Square Ring Tank		
Evaporation Mitigation System Used:	*Chemical Monolayer*	
Water Saved From Evaporation	2.9	*ML each year*
Cost to Save this Water	$188	*per ML per year*
Calculated Storage Volume at Full Supply Level	25.1	*ML*
Surface Area at Full Supply Level	1.00	*ha*
Total Cost of Evaporation Mitigation System at Installation	$1,000	
Annual Operating and Maintenance Cost	$500	

If the same storage was located outside Darwin (12.46° S, 130.93° E) in the Northern Territory (annual evaporation 2851 mm/year), with a shadecloth cover used to mitigate the evaporation from the dam, then the cost to save each ML of water is reduced because the cover is saving more water from evaporation.

DARWIN Square Ring Tank		
Evaporation Mitigation System Used:	*Shadecloth*	
Water Saved From Evaporation	21.4	*ML each year*
Cost to Save this Water	$434	*per ML per year*
Calculated Storage Volume at Full Supply Level	25.1	*ML*
Surface Area at Full Supply Level	1.00	*ha*
Total Cost of Evaporation Mitigation System at Installation	$120,000	
Annual Operating and Maintenance Cost	$200	

The *Ready Reckoner* can also be used to assess the evaporation saved per unit of surface area if the storage depth is increased. For example, if the Darwin storage is doubled in depth to 6 m and earthworks costed at $2.00/m^3.

DARWIN Square Ring Tank		
Evaporation Mitigation System Used:	*Increase Wall Height*	
Water Saved From Evaporation	11.6	*ML each year*
Cost to Save this Water	$295	*per ML per year*
Calculated Storage Volume at Full Supply Level	25.1	*ML*
Surface Area at Full Supply Level	1.00	*ha*
Total Cost of Evaporation Mitigation System at Installation	$64,800	
Annual Operating and Maintenance Cost	$0	
Total Extra Earthworks to Increase Wall Height	32,400	*m3*
Calculated Storage Volume at Full Supply Level after Increasing Wall Height	42	*ML*
Additional Water Lost to Seepage as a Result of Increasing the Wall Height	0	*ML*

With the various types of covers as well as changes to the storage depth, the *Ready Reckoner* can be used to determine the best possible approach to reduce evaporation based on site specific parameters and water use requirements.

6. References

Al-Ghobari, H.M. 2000 Estimation of reference evapotranspiration for southern region of Saudi Arabia. Irrig. Sci. 19 81-86

Allen, R.G. 1996 Assessing the integrity of weather data for use in estimation of reference evapotranspiration. J. Irrig. Drain. Eng. ASCE 122 2 97-106

Allen, R.G. 1999 Regional Advection Pertubations in an Irrigated Desert (RAPID) – impacts on Evapotranspiration. Univ, of Idaho, Wageningen Agricultural University and Utah State Univ. Aug-Sept 1999

Allen, R.G., Pereira, L.S., Raes, D., and Smith, M. 1998 Crop evapotranspiration – guidelines for computing crop water requirements. FAO Technical Paper 56, Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, Rome.

Angus, D.E. and Watts, P.J. 1984 Evapotranspiration – how good is the Bowen ratio method ? Agric. Water Mgmt 8 133-150

Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001. Water Account, Australia, 2000-01

Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2003. Year Book Australia, 2003. http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/

Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2004. Water Use on Australian Farms, 2003-04.

Australian Water Resources Council 1971 Field study of evaporation – installation, operation and maintenance of equipment. Res Proj 68/5 Tech Paper No 1. Prepared by Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation March 1971

Bastiaanssen, W.G.M. and Bandara, K.M.P.S. 2001 Evaporative depletion of irrigated watersheds in Sri Lanka. Irrig. Sci. 21 1-15

Blaney, H.F. and Criddle, W.D. 1945 Determining water requirements in irrigated areas from climatological data. Processed report by USDS- Soil Conservation Service 17

Bowen, I.S. 1926 The ratio of heat losses by conduction and by evaporation from any water surface. Phys. Rev. 27 779-787

Brotzge, J.A. and Crawford, K.C. 2002 Examination of the Surface Energy Budget: A comparison of Eddy Correlation and Bowen Ratio Measurement Systems. Journal of Hydrometeorology 4 160-178

Brutsaert, W.H. 1982 Evaporation into the atmosphere. Dordrecht, Holland. D. Reidel Publishing Co.

Brutsaert, W.H. and Stricker, H. 1979 An advection – aridity approach to estimate actual regional evaporation. Water Resour. Res. 15 443-450

Buck, A.L. 1976 The variable-path lyman-alpha hygrometer and its operating characteristics. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society 57 9 1113-1118

Burman, R. and Pochop, L.O. 1994 Evaporation, evapotranspiration and climatic data. In Developments in Atmospheric Science 22. New York. Elsevier Science B.V.

Campbell, G.S. and Tanner, B.D. 1985 A krypton hygrometer for measurement of atmospheric water vapour concentration. Moisture and Humidity 1985, Measurement and Control in Science and Industry, Proc. 1985 Intl. Symp. on Moisture and Humidity, Washington, DC, 609-612

Clewitt, J.F. 1980 Shallow Storage Irrigation for Sorghum Production in North-West Queensland, QDPI Bulletin QB85002

Condie, S.A and Webster, I.T. 1997 The influence of wind stress, temperature, and humidity gradients on evaporation from reservoirs. Water Resources Research 33 12 2813-2822

Craig, I. and Hancock, N. 2004 Methods for assessing dam evaporation – An introductory paper. IAA Conference Adelaide May 2004

Davies, J.A. and Allen, C.D. 1973 Equilibrium, potential and actual evaporation from cropped surfaces in Southern Ontario. J. Appl. Meteorol. 12 649-657

de Bruin, H.A.R., 1978 A Simple Model for Shallow Lake Evaporation. J. Appl. Meteor., 17, 1132–1134

Dingham, S.L. 1994 Physical Hydrology. New York. Macmillan Publishing Co.

Doorenbos, J. and Pruitt, W.O. 1975 Guidelines for prediction of crop water requirements, FAO Irrig. and Drainage Paper No. 24, Rome

Droogers, P. and Allen, R.G. 2002 Estimating reference evapotranspiration under inaccurate data conditions. Irrigation and Drainage Systems 16 33-45

Dyer, A.J. 1961 Measurement of evaporation and heat transfer in the lower atmosphere by an automatic eddy correlation technique. Quart. J. R. Meteorol. Soc. 87 373 401-412

Environment Australia, 2000. Water in a Dry Land - Issues and Challenges for Australia's Key Resource. Environment Australia. , 2000. Available in PDF at http://www.deh.gov.au/water/quality/waterdryland.html

Funk, J.P. 1959 Improved polythene shielded net radiometer. J. Sci Inst 36 267-69

Funk, J.P. 1962 A net radiometer designed for optimum sensitivity and a ribbon thermopile used in a miniaturized version. J. Geophys. Res 67 7 2753-60

George, B.A., Reddy, B.R.S., Raghuwanshi, N.S. and Wallender, W.W. 2002 Decision Support System for Estimating Reference Evapotranspiration. J. Irrig. Drainage. Eng. 128 1-10

Gieske, A. and Meijninger, W. 2003 High Density NOAA Time Series of ET in the Gediz Basin, Turkey. ICID Workshop on Remote Sensing of ET for Large Regions, 17 September 2003

Glanville, T.D., Baker, J.L., Melvin, S.W. and Agua, M.M. 1999, *Measurement of Seepage from Earthen Waste Storage Structures in Iowa*, Department of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering, Iowa State University (draft). Available from http://www.ag.iastate.edu/iaexp/reports/ewss_seepage.pdf

Ham, J.M. 1999 Estimating evaporation and seepage losses from lagoons used to contain animal waste. Trans ASAE 42:1303-1312

Ham, J.M. and DeSutter, T.M, 1999 Seepage losses and nitrogen export from swine waste lagoons: A water balance study. J. Environ. Qual 28:1090-1099

Hargreaves, G.H. and Samani, Z.A. 1985 Reference crop evapotranspiration from temperature. Applied Eng. Agric. 1 2 96-99

Heinrich, N. and Schmidt, E. 2006 Economic Ready Reckoner for Evaporation Mitigation Systems - Manual. Produced by Feedlot Services Australia (FSA Consulting) and the National Centre for Engineering in Agriculture (NCEA) for the National Program for Sustainable Irrigation (NPSI) June 30 2006.

Hill, R.H and Long, A.B. 1995 The CSIRO Dual-frequency Microwave Radiometer. CSIRO Division of Atmospheric Research Technical Paper No. 35. CSIRO, Victoria.

Howell, T.A. and Dusek, D.A. 1995 Comparison of vapour-pressure deficit calculation methods – Southern High Plains. J. Irrig. Drain. Eng. ASCE 121 2 191-198

Hoy, R.D. and Stephens, S. 1977 Field study of evaporation – analysis of data from Eucumbene, Cateract, Manton and Mundaring. Australian Water Resources Council Tech Paper No 21

Hussein, A.S.A. 1999 Grass ET estimates using Penman-type equations in Central Sudan. J. Irrig. Drain. Eng. 125 6 324-329

Irmak, S, Haman, D.Z. and Jones, J.W. 2002 Evaluation of class A pan coefficients for estimating reference evapotranspiration in humid location. J. Irrigation and Drainage Eng. 128 153-159

Jensen, M.E. and Haise, H.R. 1963 Estimating evapotranspiration from solar radiation. J. Irrig. Drain. Eng. 89 15-41

Kadel, B.C. and Abbe, C. 1916 Current evaporation observations by the Weather Bureau. Monthly Weath. Rev 44 674-677

Kaimal, J.C. and Gaynor, J.E. 1991 Another look at sonic thermometry. Boundary Layer Meteorol. 56 401-410

Kashyap, P.S. and Panda, R.K. 2001 Evaluation of evapotranspiration methods and development of crop-coefficients for potato crop in a sub-humid region. Agric. Water Mgmt 50 9-25

Kotwicki, Vincent. The Nature of Evaporation from Lake Alexandrina [online]. In: Water Down Under 94: Surface Hydrology and Water Resources Papers; Preprints of Papers; pages: 385-390. Barton, ACT: Institution of Engineers, Australia, 1994. National conference publication (Institution of Engineers, Australia); no. 94/15.

Lakshman, G. 1972 An aerodynamic formula to compute evaporation from open water surfaces. J. Hydrology 15 209-225

Leuning, R., Raupach, M.R., Coppin, P.A., Cleugh, H.A., Isaac, P., Denmead, O.T., Dunin, F.X. and Zegelin, S. (2004). 'Spatial and temporal variation of fluxes of energy, water vapour and carbon dioxide during OASIS 1994 and 1995', *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 110(1) 3–38.

Louden, T.L. and Reece, L.E. 1983 Seepage from earthen manure storages and lagoons : a literature review. Paper # 83-4161 presented at the 1983 ASAE winter meeting, Chicago, Dec 13-16

McIlroy, I.C. 1972 Instrument for continuous recording of natural evaporation. Agric. Meteorol 9 93-100

McLeod, M.K., Cresswell, H.P., MacLeod, D.A., Faulkner, R.D. and Daniel, H. 1998 Measurement of evapotranspiration from different pasture types using the rapid chamber method. Proc 9th Australian Agronomy Conference, Wagga Wagga, 1998

Miyake, M. and McBean, G. 1970 On the measurement of vertical humidity transport over land. Boundary Layer Meteorol. 1 1 88-101

Monteith, J.L. 1965 Evaporation and the environment. The state and movement of water in living organisms. XIXth symposium, Society for Expt Biology, Swansea, Cambridge Univ. Cambridge, England 205-234

Morton, F.I. 1983 Operational estimates of areal evapotranspiration and their significance to the science and practice of hydrology. J. Hydrol. 66 1-76

Myers, T. 1999 Water Balance of Lake Powell: an assessment of groundwater seepage and evaporation. Prepared for the Glen Canyon Inst.,Salt Lake City Utah.

NLWRA 2001a. Australian Water Resources Assessment 2000. Surface water and groundwater - availability and quality. National Land and Water Resources Audit, Canberra.

NLWRA 2001b. Australian Agricultural Assessment, National Land and Water Resources Audit, Canberra.
http://www.anra.gov.au/topics/agriculture/pubs/national/agriculture_contents.html

Oke, T.R. 1987 Boundary Layer Climates 2nd ed. Routledge - London and New York

Omar, M.H. and El-Bakry, M.M. 1981 Estimation of evaporation from the lake of Aswan High Dam (Lake Nasser) based on measurements over the lake. Agricultural Meteorology 23 293-308

Oroud, I.M. 1998 The influence of heat conduction on evaporation from sunken pans in hot, dry environment. *Journal of Hydrology* 210 1-10

Penman, H.L. 1948 Natural evaporation from open water, bare soil and grass. Proc. Royal Soc London A193 120-146

Penman, H.L. 1956. Estimating Evaporation. Transactions, American Geophysical Union. 37(1): 43-50.

Penman, H.L. 1963 Vegetation and Hydrology. Tech comment no. 53, Commonwealth Bureau of Soils, Harpenden, England

Prata, A.J. 1990 Satellite-derived evaporation from Lake Eyre, South Australia. Int J. Remote Sensing 11 11 2051-2068

Priestley, CHB and Taylor, R.J. 1972 On the assessment of surface heat flux and evaporation using large scale parameters. Mon. Weather Rev. 100 81-92

Randall, D.T., Hanley, T.E. and Larison, O.K. 1965: The NRL Lyman-alpha humidiometer. In A. Wexler, (Ed.), Humidity and Moisture, Vol. 1, Reinhold Publishing, 444–454

Raupach, M.R. 1978 Infrared fluctuation hygrometry in the atmospheric surface layer. Quart. J. R. Meteorol. Soc. 104 309-322

Raupach, M.R., Leuning, R. and co-authors 2003 Overview of OASIS: a large scale field experiment on Biosphere-Atmosphere exchanges of energy, water and trace gases in heterogeneous terrain. CSIRO Centre for Environmental Mechanics http://www.clw.csiro.au/research/waterway/interactions/oasis/abs3.htm

Redford, T.G., Verma, S.B. and Rosenberg, N.J. 1980 Humidity fluctuations over a vegetated surface measured with a Lyman-alpha hygrometer and a fine-wire thermocouple psychrometer. J. Appl. Meteor. 19 7 860-867

Scott, M. 1996 A guide to the measurement of humidity. Instr. Meas. Control National Physical Laboratory, UK

Shuttleworth, W.J. and Wallace, J.S. 1985 Evaporation from sparse crops – an energy combination theory. Quart. J. R. Meteorol. Soc. 111, 839-855

Silver, J.A. and Hovde, D.C. 1998 A comparison of near-infrared diode techniques for airborne hygrometry. J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol. 15 29-35

Slatyer, R.O. and McIlroy, I.C. 1961 Practical micrometeorology. CSIRO Melbourne.

Staats, W., Foskett, W. and. Jensen, H.P. 1965 Infrared. Absorption Hygrometer. in Humidity and Moisture, Measurement, and Control in Science and Industry. Vol 1 Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York pp465-480

Stewart, R.B. and Rouse, W.R. 1976 A simple method for determining the evaporation from shallow lakes and ponds. Water Resource Research 12(4) 623-628

Swinbank, W.C. 1951 The measurement of vertical transfer of heat and water vapour by eddies in the lower atmosphere. J. Meteorology 8 3 135-145

Thom, A.S. and Oliver, H.R. 1977 On Penman's equation for estimating regional evaporation. Quart J Roy Meteorol Soc 103 345-357

Thompson, J.R. 1975, Energy budgets for three small plots—substantiation of Priestley and Taylor's large scale evaporation parameter, *Journal Applied Meteorology* 14, 1399–1401.

Turc, L. 1961 Estimation of irrigation water requirements, potential evapotranspiration – a simple climatic formula evolved up to date. Ann Agron 12, 13-14

van Dijk, A. 2003 The Principles of Surface Flux Physics. Available at http://research.eeescience.utoledo.edu/lees/papers_PDF/vanDijk_EC_Tutorial.pdf

Ventura, F., Spano, D., Duce, P. and Snyder, R.L. 1999 An evaluation of common evapotranspiration equations. Irrig. Sci. 18 163-170

Watts, P.J. 1983 Evaporation from an agricultural catchment – a field and theoretical study of evaporation. PhD thesis, University of Melbourne..

Watts, P.J. and Hancock, N.H. 1984 Evaporation and potential evaporation – a practical approach for agricultural engineers. Inst. Eng. Aust. Nat. Conf. Pub 84/6 290-298

Webster, I.T., and Sherman, B.S 1995 Evaporation from fetch limited water bodies.   Irrig Sci 16 53-64

Weeks, W.D. 1983 The Calculation of Evaporation in Queensland. Queensland Division Technical Papers, Institution of Engineers Australia Vol.24 No. 4, March.

White, I. and Denmead, O.T. 1989 Point and whole basin estimates of seepage and evaporation losses from a saline groundwater-disposal basin. In Comparisons in Austral Hydrology: Hydrology and Water Resources Symposium. 361-366. University of Canterbury, Christchurch, NZ

Wielderhold, P.R. 1997 True accuracy of humidity measurement. http://www.sensorsmag.com/articles/0997/humidity/main.shtml

Wilson, K.B., Baldocchi, D.D., Aubinet, M. and coauthors 2002 'Energy partitioning between latent and sensible heat flux during the warm season at FLUXNET sites', *Water Resources Research*, 38 (12) 1294.

Appendix 1: Manufacturers participating In the NRM&W Evaporation Control Project

1) Nylex Water Solutions – WaterSavr monolayer

Contact: Brendon Mason (Business Development Manager)
                Nylex Water Solutions
                29 Nepean Way, Mentone Vic. 3194
                Phone (03) 9581 0211 Mob 0419 315 407

Email: brendon.mason@nylex.com.au

Website: www.nylexwater.com.au

2) Evaporation Control Systems – E-VapCap

Contact: Warwick Hill (Managing Director)
                Evaporation Control Systems (installer Darling Downs Tarpaulins)

Phone: (07) 4665 6144

Website: www.evaporationcontrol.com.au

3) Netpro shadecloth

Contact: Graham Minifie (Managing Director)
                Lot 1 Sullivan Drive
                Stanthorpe Industrial Estate
                PO Box 337, Stanthorpe Qld 4380

Email: graham_minifie@netprocanopies.com

Website: www.netprocanopies.com

4) Water Innovations – AquaGuard (hexagonal module)

Contact: Ross Woodfield (Director), George Design (Engineer)
                PO BOX 347 Nathan Qld 4111
                Phone (07) 3423 7127
                Website www.waterinnovations.com.au

5) RMIT/RioTinto – AquaCap

Contact: Ian Burston (Research Engineer)
                Department of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering
                Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology

Phone: (03) 9872 3272

Email: ianb@alphalink.com.au

6) Integrated Packaging – Raftex

Contact: Peter Johnstone (Managing Director)
                35 Robins Avenue,
                Humevale Vic. 3757

Phone: (03) 9474 4286

Mobile: 0413 949 007

Email: pjohnstone@ipstretch.com

Website: http://www.ipstretch.com

7) Ciba Speciality Chemicals – PAM

Contact: Andrew McHugh
                CIBA Specialty Chemicals
                6-8 Donaldson St Wyong, NSW 2259

Phone: 1800 687 897, (03) 9282 0600

Mobile: 0417 017 703

Email: andrew.mchugh@cibasc.com

Website: http://www.cibasc.com/ind-agr.htm

Appendix 2: Full List of Evaporation Control Products

This section is a summary of information from an internet search using 'Evaporation Control Product' as the main search term. The information is summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Summary of evaporation mitigation technology products referred to on the internet

Cover Type	Cover Name	Key Advantages	Cost
Chemical (Monolayer Covers)	*Water$avr	Very low initial setup costs and relatively low ongoing maintenance costs.	$18.00/kg with an application rate of .5–1 kg/ha
	Hydrotect	Very low initial setup costs requiring minimal capital expenditure.	$5.00/kg with an application rate of 1.5 kg/ha
Chemical (PAM)	*CIBA PAM	PAM can reduce erosion and nutrient runoff in the field and also reduce seepage from the water storage.	It is expected to cost $25/ML.
Floating Covers	*Evaporation Control System E-VapCap	Reduction of salt build up, improved water quality, reduction in algal growth, reduction in wave action and reduced bank erosion.	$7.00/m^2 but these costs are dependant on transport costs and may be site specific.
	Aquaguard Evaporation Cover	Reduces algae growth, allows rainwater to enter the storage, reduces erosion from wind and wave action, slower salt build up.	The estimated cost is $6.00–$6.60/m^2 installed. Cost subject to site location.
	CURV	The product is relatively cheap and long lasting.	The estimated cost is around $3.50/m^2 or more.
	C.W. NEAL Corp Defined Sump floating cover	Long lasting and prevents light from entering the storage and so eliminates algal growth and increases water quality.	The anticipated cost is $30/m^2 but this price is subject to size of site and the site conditions.
	Evap-Mat	Heat reflective, self-protecting in high winds (up to 150 kph) whether empty or full. It is simple and easy to install, the cover is also suitable for all storage sizes, shapes and profiles up to 2 km wide.	$3.50/m^2 for complete installation.
	Fabtech	No light passes through the cover so this product reduces algal growth in the storage which can cause problems with irrigation sprinkler blockages.	$7.00/m^2 but this price does not include any earthworks required for the installation.
	REVOC floating cover	The cover can be inflated for maintenance and inspection of the storage.	The anticipated cost is $30/m^2 but this price is subject to size of site and the site conditions.
	RTD Enterprises	Reduces algal growth and wave action.	$28.38–$63.86/m^2 (US $21.53–48.44/m^2). The cost of this product is site specific and therefore it may vary.
Shade Structures	*NetPro cabled shade cover	The cover does not float on the water so there are no problems with changing water levels.	$7.00–10.00 (US $6.00-7.50/m^2)
	Aquaspan	The structure is long lasting and the cover is not affected by changing water levels.	The cover costs approximately $33.00/m^2.
	MuzCov	The cover allows easy access to the storage for maintenance operations.	The anticipated costs are $7.50/m^2.

Modular Covers	*Raftex	Easy to install and remove form the storage.	The anticipated cost of this product is $ 4.00–5.00/m^2.
	AQUACAP	Minimal bank erosion and turbidity due to reduced wave action there will also be a reduced concentration of nutrients and salts in the water and possibly a reduction in algal booms.	The estimated cost is $17/m^2 installed.
	Euro-matic Bird Balls	Reduce light penetration and therefore algal growth and are virtually maintenance free. They allow rainfall to penetrate the storage and they adjust with changing water levels.	The approximate cost is $22.80/m^2.
	Layfield Modular Cover	Maintenance is easy to carry out as damaged modules may be removed independently and with ease.	Unavailable
	LemTec Modular Single Sheet Cover System	Reduces algae and also reduces the amount of total suspended solids in the storage and this product is relatively easy to install.	Information unavailable.
	HexDome™	It has been shown to greatly reduce the effects of wave actione – easily installed by the customer.	The anticipated cost is between $4.50–8.00/m^2
	MOD-E-VAP	Easy to install by the land owner and easy to remove the cover if necessary. There is no need for an anchor trench and maintenance costs are expected to be minimal.	The product has an estimated cost of $3.00–3.50/m^2 depending on the catchment area shape.
	POLYNET	Quick and easy to install.	The anticipated cost is $2.50/m$^{2.}$
	QUIT Evap Modular Floating Cover	Lightweight and easy to install.	The estimated cost is around $6.00–8.00/m^2 plus transport and installation.

* Indicates the products evaluated in this project.

(Note information provided in this table is based on the promotion material provided for each product).

Water$avr

Description:	Water$avr is a white powdered product which is comprised of hydrated lime with a cetyl/stearyl alcohol flow aid which forms a film on the water surface. This product is made of food grade chemicals which are biodegradable in 2 ½ to 3 days and it is permeable to oxygen.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	ONDEO Nalco Australia Pty Ltd. and Flexible Solutions Int. Inc. Flexible Solutions International Ltd.
Address:	615 Discovery Street Victoria, BC Canada V8T 5G4
Phone:	+1 250 477 9969
Fax:	+1 250 477 9912
Email:	infowatersavr@flexiblesolutions.com
Website:	http://www.flexiblesolutions.com/products/watersavr/

Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Reduces evaporation by up to 30 per cent.
Costs:	$18.00/kg with an application rate of 0.5–1kg/ha.
Durability:	Breaks down in 2 ½ to 3 days.
Installation:	Very easy to apply with a patented self applicator, by hand or with a boat. The wind direction must be taken into consideration when applying the product so as to gain an effective unbroken film.
Advantages:	Very low initial setup costs and relatively low ongoing maintenance costs.

Hydrotect

Description:	Hydrotect is a water-evaporation retardant which is an emulsion of 60 per cent water and 40 per cent aliphatic alcohols. This product is claimed to be non-toxic, biodegradable and suitable for application to drinking water.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	Swift and Co Ltd. Neil Clifford (Business Manager)
Phone:	+61 3 8544 3159
Fax:	+61 3 8544 3259
Mob:	0425 724 085
Email:	nclifford@im.aust.com
Website:	www.swiftco.com.au
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Hydrotect is claimed to reduce evaporation in larger storages by 25–35 per cent.
Costs:	$5.00/kg with an application rate of 1.5kg/ha.
Durability:	The product has to be reapplied daily.
Installation:	Very easy to apply by machine or by hand with a boat. The wind direction must be taken into consideration when applying the product so as to gain an effective unbroken film.
Advantages:	Very low initial setup costs requiring minimal capital expenditure.

Evaporation Control System E-VapCap

Description:	E-VapCap is a heavy duty polyethylene 'bubble wrap' style product with a white surface to reflex heat and a black bubble underside which provide flotation and stops light penetration. Both of the layers are UV

                stabilised and 10mm diameter holes are positioned at 1000mm centres to allow rainfall penetration and the release of gases from the storage.

Manufacturer/Supplier: Sealed Air Australia Pty Ltd (SAA), Evaporation Control Systems Pty Ltd (ECS) and Darling Downs Tarpaulins Pty Ltd (DDT)

Address: Evaporation Control Systems Pty Ltd (ECS)

Phone: (07) 4665 6144

Fax: (07) 4665 6395

Website: http://www.evaporationcontrol.com.au/index.1.htm

Approved installers:

        Darling Downs Tarpaulins Pty Ltd:

                Website: http://www.ddt.com.au/

        C E Bartlett Pty Ltd:

                Website: http://www.bartlett.net.au/

        Ertech Pty Ltd. Western Australia:

                Website: http://www.ertech.com.au/

Performance as stated
by the manufacturer: E-VapCap has been shown to reduce evaporation by as much as 90–95%.

Costs: $7.00/m^2 but these costs are dependant on transport costs and may be site specific.

Durability: E-VapCap offers a 5 year warranty and expected life of 12 or more years.

Installation: The ease of installing this product is site specific and also dependant on the weather conditions as wind can create problems during installation.

Advantages: Reduction of salt build up, improved water quality, reduction in algal growth, reduction in wave action and reduced bank erosion.

Aquaguard Evaporation Cover

Description: The cover is manufactured from a laminated polyethylene bubble with a beige/white top and black underside; the light top reflects heat while the black underside eliminates light. The material has positive buoyancy due to the "bubble" material and so floats on the water surface.

Manufacturer/Supplier:	Fabric Solutions by PyramidDOME Australia Pty Ltd.Fabric Solutions International
Address:	9A Production Avenue Ernest Qld 4214
Phone:	(07) 5563 3755
Email:	info@fabricsolutions.com.au
Website:	http://www.fabricsolutions.com.au/evaporative_covers.htm
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Up to a 90 per cent reduction in evaporation.
Costs:	The estimated cost is $6.00–6.60/m^2 installed. Cost subject to site location.
Durability:	UV resistant long life material.
Installation:	The cover is installed by Fabric Solutions and the ease of installation is related to the site conditions, size and weather conditions.
Advantages:	Significantly reduces algal growth, allows rainwater to enter the storage, slows salt build up and reduces erosion from wind and wave action.

CURV

Description:	A new form of polypropylene sheet made in a patented process: the sheets are 0.3 mm thick and they are attached to cables on either side of the storage. Smaller strips of the product can then be interwoven for stability. The product floats on the surface and is kept in tension by the cables.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	Still in its development stage.
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Unknown at this stage.
Costs:	The estimated cost is around $3.50/m^2 or more.
Durability:	It is expected to be highly durable and long lasting.
Installation:	Not known at this stage.
Advantages:	The product is relatively cheap and long lasting.

C.W. NEAL Corp Defined sump floating cover

Description:	The defined sump style cover is constructed with a polyester fabric reinforced geomembrane such as Hypalon or polypropylene with thicknesses ranging from 0.91mm to 1.14mm.The cover uses ballast

tubes in the centre to keep it taught. The cover is also impermeable, so storm water collects in the ballast lines and is removed through a network of hoses either via gravity or electric pumps.

Manufacturer/Supplier:	C. W. Neal Corporation
Address:	8625 Argent St Santee, CA 92071 USA
Phone:	+1 619 562-1200 (800) 377-8404
Fax:	(619) 562-1150
E-Mail:	info@cwneal.com
Website:	http://www.cwneal.com/floatingcover.htm
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Reduces evaporation by up to 95%
Costs as at Dec 04:	The anticipated cost is $30/m^2 but this price is subject to size of site and site conditions.
Durability:	This product is said to last 20–30 years.
Installation:	To install this product the storage is required to be empty and the cover is installed by C.W. Neal Corp.
Advantages:	The cover is long lasting and prevents light from entering the storage, eliminating algal growth and therefore increasing water quality.

Evap-Mat

Description:	The cover is comprised of laminated 20 micron, stainless steel mesh and 0.4mm bubble HDPE sheet. The cover is anchored to the storage floor by cables attached to a buried polyethylene pipe. It is designed to only cover 90% of the water surface area.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	Reservoir Covers Australia (Pty Ltd proposed extension).
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	May reduce evaporation by up to 90 per cent depending on the water level of the storage.
Costs:	$3.50/m^2 for complete installation.
Durability:	Life expectancy of 30 or more years – resistant to UV light and oxidation.
Installation:	Not available.
Advantages:	It is simple and easy to install, heat reflective and self-protecting in high winds (up to 150 kph) whether empty or full. The cover is also suitable for all storage sizes, shapes and profiles up to 2 km wide.

Fabtech

Description:	High density polyethylene (HDPE) or unsupported polypropylene with a thickness of 0.5 to 1mm with flotation material attached and sand filled ballast tubes in the centre to take up the slack in the cover due to changes in the water level. The sand tubes also form sumps from which rainwater can be pumped into the storage using small submersible pumps. The cover is secured in a 600mm deep anchor trench around the storage wall.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	Fabtech SA Pty Ltd
Address:	53 South Terrace Winfield SA 5013
Phone:	(08) 8347 3111
Email:	lorri@fabtech.com.au
Website:	http://www.fabtech.com.au/Covers/covers.html
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Estimated to reduce evaporation by up to 95 per cent.
Costs:	$7.00/m^2 but this price does not include any earthworks required for the installation.
Durability:	Design life a minimum of 15 years.
Installation:	The storage is required to be empty.
Advantages:	No light passes through the cover so it reduces algal growth in the storage (which can cause problems with irrigation sprinkler blockages).

REVOC floating cover

Description:	Scrim reinforced Hypalon or scrim reinforced polypropylene with flotation material attached; sand filled ballast tubes in the centre form sumps from which rainwater can be pumped into the storage using small submersible pumps. The cover is attached to patented self tensioners around the perimeter to keep the cover taught allowing people to walk all over the cover. Access ports are also incorporated into the design to allow for maintenance and also to allow the cover to be inflated for ease of repair under the cover.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	Layfield Environmental Systems Corp also, C. W. Neal Corporation 8625 Argent St Santee, CA 92071 USA
Phone:	+1 619 562-1200 (800) 377-8404
Fax:	(619) 562-1150
E-Mail:	info@cwneal.com

Website:	http://www.cwneal.com/floatingcover.htm
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Reduce evaporation by up to 95 per cent
Costs as at Dec 04:	The anticipated cost is $30/m^2 but this price is subject to size of site and site conditions.
Durability as stated by the manufacturer:	The Hypalon cover has 30 year warranty.
Installation:	The storage is required to be empty.
Advantages:	The cover is able to be inflated for maintenance and inspection of the storage.

RTD Enterprises

Description:	This floating cover is made from reinforced products such as Hypalon or polypropylene. This cover is typically incorporated with a liner to totally seal the storage.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	RTD Enterprises
Address:	P.O. Box 247, 196 Old Point Avenue Madison, Maine 04950 USA
Phone:	+1 207 696 3964
Fax:	+1 207 696 0815
Email:	info@rtd-enterprises.com
Website:	http://www.rtd-enterprises.com
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	No information available.
Costs as at Dec 04:	$28.38–63.86/m^2 (US$21.53–48.44/m^2).(The cost of this product is site specific and therefore may vary.)
Durability:	The cover is made from long lasting product.
Installation:	Not available.
Advantages:	Not available.

NetPro cabled shade cover

Description:	High tension cable, incorporating long life 300g/m^2 90+% black monofilament shade cloth. In essence the cable design acts as a giant spider web, with all cables spliced at crossover points to disperse the load evenly and to eliminate product creep due to wind.

Manufacturer/Supplier: NetPro Pty Ltd.

Address: NetPro Protective Canopies

Lot 1 Sullivan Drive Stanthorpe, Qld 4380

Free Call: 1800 501 337

Phone: +61 7 4681 6666

Fax: +61 7 4681 6600
Email: sales@netprocanopies.com
Website: http://www.netprocanopies.com/npcrd.php

Performance as stated
by the manufacturer: It has been shown to reduce evaporation by around 75%

Costs: $6.00–7.50/m^2

Durability: It is expected that the shade cloth will have a life of over 30 years.

Installation: The storage is required to be empty for the installation of the pole supports.

Advantages: The cover does not float on the water so there are no problems with changing water levels.

Aquaspan

Description: Aquaspan is comprised of a patented polymer fabric which is suspended above the water storage via the use of steel support posts and cable. The fabric used is purpose designed and blocks 98% of light and reduces temperatures beneath by 31%. The fabric is a densely knitted membrane which reduces and stabilises the water temperature reducing vapour pressure adjacent to the surface and effectively insulating the water.

Manufacturer/Supplier: Aquaspan Pty Ltd and Gale Pacific Limited.

Address: Aquaspan Pty Ltd (Gary Gale)

P.O. Box 367 Braeside Vic. 3195

Performance as stated
by the manufacturer: Evaporation is reduced by 76–84%.

Costs: The cover costs approximately $33.00/m^2.

Durability: The fabric is UV stabilised and supported by a 20 year warranty against UV breakdown.

Installation: The cover is able to be installed regardless of the water level in the
storage.

Advantages:	The structure is long lasting and the cover is not affected by changing water levels.

MuzCov

Description:	The cover is comprised of high tension cables supported by poles with shade cover panels attached to the cables. The high tension cables give the structure stability while still allowing some natural movement. The structure is designed to allow heavy machinery access to the storage for maintenance and operational activities with minimal disruption.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	Designed at the Dalby Agricultural College and still in initial concept stage. Murray Choat. Dalby Agricultural College
Address:	PO Box 398 Dalby Qld 4405
Phone:	(07) 4672 3100
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Unknown at this stage.
Costs:	The anticipated costs are $7.50/m^2
Durability:	Unknown at this stage but it is expected to have a long life span.
Installation:	Unknown at this stage.
Advantages:	The cover allows easy access to the storage for maintenance operations.

Raftex

Description:	Raftex modules comprise a fully enclosed rectangular plastic pipe frame with maximum dimensions of 12m x 2m. The plastic pipes are 50 or 75 mm (2" or 3") diameter and are joined using force fit right angle joiners. The frames are also strengthened with plastic brace rods every 2 metres. The frame is easily assembled on site with the pre-drilled holes for the brace rods. Once the frame is assembled it is then machine wrapped in multiple layers of UV stabilised adhesive film which totally encloses the frame to form a raft. Holes are then drilled through the film and pipe to allow the raft to partially fill with water and so act as an anchor for the raft in windy conditions.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	IPEX Bulk Systems International Pty Ltd, trading as F Cubed (F^3). Peter Johnstone
Address:	35 Robins Avenue Humevale VIC. 3757
Phone:	(03) 9716 1195
Mob:	0413 949 007

Fax: (03) 9716 1541

Email: pjjohnstone@ipstretch.com

Performance as stated
by the manufacturer: This product is still in its trial stage.

Costs: The anticipated cost of this product is $4.00–5.00/m^2.

Durability: The product is UV stabilised and the film has an anticipated life of 5 years. At the end of this time F^3 will provide complete refurbishment. The frame is expected to have a much longer working life than the film.

Installation: Installation of this cover is easy and may be carried out by the owner.

Advantages: Easy to install and remove from the storage.

Aquacap

Description: Aquacap is a free-standing floating modular cover using individual modules with a diameter of approximately 1 m. These modules have specific design attributes to maximise their effectiveness in reducing evaporation loss from open water storages. The modules are used to cover up to 90 per cent of the surface area of a water body. Aquacap modules have unique suction properties that make them stable on a water surface.

Manufacturer/Supplier: The product was designed by Ian Burston.

Performance as stated
by the manufacturer: Field studies have shown that Aquacap reduces evaporation by an average of 70% when 80% of the water surface is covered.

Costs: The estimated cost is $17/m^2 installed.

Durability: It is expected to have a long lifespan.

Installation: The cover may be easily installed by the owner.

Advantages: Minimal bank erosion and turbidity due to reduced wave action; there will also be a reduced concentration of nutrients and salts in the water and possibly a reduction in algal booms.

Euro-matic Bird Balls

Description: Bird balls are hollow black balls that form a floating cover; they are made of high density polyethylene (HDPE) or polyethylene and come in a range of sizes from10 to150mm in diameter.

Manufacturer/Supplier: Euro-Matic Ltd - Contact: Adrian Wilkes (Director)

Address:	Clausen House Perivale Industrial Park Horsenden Lane South Greenford Middlesex UB6 7QE UK
Phone:	+ 44 20 8991 2211
Fax:	+ 44 20 8997 5074
Email:	sales@euro-matic.com
Website:	http://www.enquip.com/BirdBalls.html
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	They may reduce evaporation by up to 90 per cent.
Costs:	The approximate cost is $22.80/m^2.
Installation:	Installation of bird balls is very easy and may be carried out by the owner.
Durability:	The balls are UV stabilised and are long lasting.
Advantages:	Reduce light penetration (and therefore algal growth) and are virtually maintenance free. They allow rainfall to penetrate the storage and adjust with changing water levels.

Layfield Modular Cover

Description:	A typical floating module measures 15.24 x 15.24 m (50 x 50 feet) or 30.48 x 30.48 m (100 x 100 feet). The modules are floated out onto the storage and then lashed together by ropes or webbing. In storages with fluctuating levels, special panels can be made to take up slack around the perimeter.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	Layfield Plastics Inc.
Address:	Head Office in Seattle, Washington USA
Phone:	+1 425-254-1075
Email:	international@layfieldgroup.com
Website:	http://www.geotextile.ca/
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Unavailable
Costs:	Unavailable
Durability:	The modules are made from long lasting material and are expected to have a long working life.

Installation: Modules are manufactured in ideal conditions in the factory and then installation is easily carried out by floating the modules into position on the storage. Installation does not necessarily require a trained professional.

Advantages: Maintenance on the cover is easy to carry out as damaged modules may be removed independently and with ease.

LemTec Modular Single Sheet Cover System

Description: The LemTec modular cover system uses 10 year UV resistant, High Density Polyethylene (HDPE) geomembrane sheets with encapsulated, closed-cell, lateral extruded-polystyrene insulation for flotation. These sheets are laced together during installation to form a complete cover. The edges of the cover are anchored to the perimeter of the storage with LemTec's unique anchoring system.

Manufacturer/Supplier: Lemna Technologies, Inc.

Address: 2445 Park Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota
USA 55404-3790

Phone: (612) 253-2002

Fax: (612) 253-2003

Email: techsales@lemna.com

Website:
http://www.lemnatechnologies.com/pdf/productSummaries/LemTecCoverProductSummary.pdf

Performance as stated
by the manufacturer: Information unavailable.

Costs: Information unavailable.

Durability: Made from long lasting HDPE material which is 10 year UV resistant.

Installation: For installation of this cover fewer people are required than other products on the market. No heavy equipment is needed and the storage does not need to be empty.

Advantages: Reduces algae and also the amount of total suspended solids in the storage – product is relatively easy to install.

HexDome™

Description: An independent modular system made from UV resistant recycled plastic – each module covers one square metre.

Manufacturer/Supplier: Indusium Pty Ltd and tested by the Queensland University of Technology. Stoph Vanwensveen

Email: stvn@bigpond.com

Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Reduce evaporation by up to 90%
Costs:	The anticipated cost is $4.50–8.00/m^2
Durability:	Expected life of more than 25 years.
Installation:	This cover may be easily installed by the owner.
Advantages:	It has been shown to greatly reduce the effects of wave action, and is easily installed by the customer.

MOD-E-VAP

Description:	This product consists of a simple and easy to install modular plate system of polyethylene pipe, fittings and sheeting. Each module has a rigid framework of high density polyethylene (HDPE) pipe and fittings restraining, via plastic sheet clips, linear low density polyethylene sheets (LLDPE). The individual plates are then inter-connected utilising manufactured polyvinyl chloride 'nuckle joints'.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	Merit Lining Systems Pty Ltd
Address:	6 Lombark Street Acacia Ridge Qld 4110
Phone:	(07) 3275 3950
Fax:	(07) 3275 3960
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Not known at this stage.
Costs:	The product has an estimated cost of $3.00–3.50/m^2 depending on the catchment area shape.
Durability:	It is expected to be long lasting.
Installation:	The modular cover is easy to install.
Advantages:	Easy to install by the land owner and easy to remove the cover if necessary. There is no need for an anchor trench and maintenance costs are expected to be minimal.

Polynet

Description:	Polynet is a floating modular product that is comprised of expanded 20mm thick polystyrene sheets wrapped in a net and secured into pockets in the net in sections. Each section is prefabricated into 50 m x 5 m units which can then be floated out onto the storage.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	Product designed by Ken Gordon but still in concept stage.
Address:	1 Euro Street PO Box 33 Gilgandra N.S.W 2827
Phone/Fax:	(02) 6847 1381

Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Not known at this stage.
Costs:	The anticipated cost is $2.50/m^{2}.
Durability:	It is expected to be long lasting.
Installation:	Installation of this product is relatively easy and could be done by the owner.
Advantages:	Quick and easy to install.

QUIT Evap Modular Floating Cover

Description:	Quit Evap is a rectangular modular floating cover, manufactured from 0.5–0.75 mm thick polypropylene sheet with polystyrene floats. The modules are interconnected by Velcro straps. The full scale modules are up to 5 m x 25–30 m.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	SMEC Australia Pty Ltd. (Contact: Peter Chapman)
Address:	1st floor, 105 Denham Street Townsville Qld 4810
Phone:	(07) 4771 6119
Fax:	(07) 4771 6120
Email:	Peter.Chapman@smec.com.au
Performance as stated by the manufacturer:	Can effectively achieve 90–95 per cent coverage of the water surface and reduce evaporation by 85–90 per cent.
Costs:	The estimated cost is around $6.00–8.00/m^{2} plus transport and installation.
Durability:	The cover has a minimum life span of 5 years with a potential life of 8–10 years – the cover is also UV stabilised.
Installation:	Installation of this product is easy and may be done by the owner.
Advantages:	Lightweight and easy to install.

CIBA PAM

Description:	PAM stands for polyacrylamide, which is a chemical that is added to water in low concentrations to thicken it and therefore reduce evaporation.
Manufacturer/Supplier:	Ciba Specialty Chemicals Pty Limited
Address:	235 Settlement Road PO Box 332 Thomastown VIC. 3074

Phone:	+61 3 9282 0600
Fax:	+61 3 9465 9070
Email:	customerservice.au@cibasc.com
Website:	http://www.cibasc.com/ind-agr.htm

Performance as stated
by the manufacturer: Not known at this stage.

Costs: It is expected to cost $25/ML.

Durability: Not available.

Installation: Very easy to apply to the water.

Advantages: PAM can reduce erosion and nutrient runoff in the field and also
                          reduce seepage from the water storage.

DKCRC Partners

AIATSIS
Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies

Australian Government
Department of Families,
Community Services
and Indigenous Affairs

ANU
THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Centre for Remote Health
A joint centre of Flinders University and Charles Darwin University

CHARLES DARWIN UNIVERSITY

CSIRO

Curtin
University of Technology

desert peoples centre

Government of South Australia
Department of Water, Land and
Biodiversity Conservation

Government of
Western
Australia

Griffith
UNIVERSITY

JCU
JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY

MURDOCH
UNIVERSITY
PERTH, WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Northern
Territory
Government

NEWMONT
The Gold Company

NSW DEPARTMENT OF
PRIMARY INDUSTRIES

Southern Cross
UNIVERSITY

TANGENTYERE COUNCIL

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ADELAIDE
AUSTRALIA

University of
South Australia

THE UNIVERSITY
OF QUEENSLAND
AUSTRALIA

THE UNIVERSITY OF
WESTERN AUSTRALIA

University of
Wollongong

"doing good work with families"