

Predicting the Optimum Time to Apply Monolayers to Irrigation

Channels

A dissertation submitted by

Michelle Winter, Bachelor Engineering (Civil) (Honours)

For the award of

Masters of Engineering Research

2012

# Predicting the Optimum Time to Apply Monolayers to Irrigation Channels

Michelle Winter

Modernisation, Goulburn-Murray Water

## Abstract

The research project aimed to investigate the potential of using chemical monolayers on irrigation channels to reduce evaporation losses. Monolayers consist of a film one molecule thick that covers the entire water surface and reduces water evaporation. The effectiveness of monolayers at reducing evaporation from still water bodies has been widely studied, with the technology having been adopted by some irrigation authorities on storage dams. However, little research has been done into investigating the effectiveness of monolayers in reducing evaporation in flowing situations. Goulburn-Murray Water has an extensive network of irrigation channels of which evaporative losses are a major component of the total yearly water losses (approximately 70 GL/year). The purpose of this work was to establish a decision support system to predict under what situations it is most appropriate for Goulburn-Murray Water to apply monolayers to irrigation channels.

Closed and flowing channel trials were conducted by Goulburn Murray Water. The closed channel trials indicated that using monolayers on irrigation channels could result in potential savings of between 10% and 30%, while the flowing trials gave promising preliminary results into the ability of ES300 to pass a regulating structure and reform with surface pressure adequate to suppress evaporation.

Modelling the use of monolayers on irrigation channels has shown that the most critical barrier to the cost effectiveness of monolayers is the ability to pass culvert structures. Therefore, it is imperative that investigations are undertaken to determine whether a technique can be developed to allow monolayers to pass culvert structures. The model needed to take into consideration many variables including evaporation rates, wind impacts, material costs and channel dimensions.

Modelling also indicated that where monolayers are unable to pass culvert structures, cost effectiveness is increased if the flow of the monolayer down the channel can be slowed, thereby retaining the monolayer on the channel for longer and reducing the number of times it needs to be reapplied. Methods to achieve this include applying monolayer to the longer pools and applying when wind direction opposes channel flow.

If no technique can be found to allow monolayers to pass culvert structures then this technique remains a costly method of saving evaporation water due to the continual reapplication of product. Its main attractiveness for use is that it can be used when and where required without large capital investment and at times when the cost can be warranted by the value of water.

The model is specific to the Goulburn-Murray Water channel system, however flow charts have been developed to enable other irrigation authorities to characterise their irrigation network in order to apply the model to their situation. In order to use the model, Goulburn-Murray Water needs to set the maximum \$/ML that it is willing to pay at that time and then review the model output to determine where to apply monolayers to achieve that result.

Depending on the drivers to save water, monolayers are most suited to application on the longest pools. Savings at well below \$200/ML can be achieved by applying ES300 to the 1% longest carrier channels when evaporation is 4.5 mm/day or greater, however the total volume that could be expected to be saved under these conditions is only 70 ML or 0.1% of the current total losses due to channel evaporation. The total savings achieved and the average cost of achieving those savings are intrinsically related and an improvement in one will detrimentally affect the other.

Keywords:

Monolayer, irrigation, channel, Victoria, flow, agriculture, evaporation

## Certification of Dissertation

I certify that the ideas, experimental work, results, analyses, software and conclusions reported in this dissertation are entirely my own effort, except where otherwise acknowledged. I also certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted for any other award, except where otherwise acknowledged.

---

Signature of candidate	Date
------------------------	------

---

Signature of Supervisor	Date
-------------------------	------

---

Signature of Supervisor	Date
-------------------------	------

## Acknowledgements

Name	Details
Bruce Albrecht	G-MW employee working on the evaporation mitigation project, provided guidance, review, field and laboratory results
Mark Bailey	G-MW manager, provided guidance
Matthew Davis	G-MW employee, provided review
Peter Egglestone	G-MW manager, provided review
Nigel Hancock	USQ supervisor
Fiona Nioa	G-MW manager, provided review
Jeremy Nolan	G-MW manager, provided review
Derek Poulton	Former G-MW employee & manager, provided guidance and review
Rod Smith	USQ supervisor
Willem Vlotman	Former G-MW employee & manager, provided guidance and review

## Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ISSUE.....	1
1.2	AIM OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT.....	5
1.3	STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION.....	6
2	BACKGROUND & LITERATURE REVIEW .....	8
2.1	PRINCIPLES OF EVAPORATION .....	8
2.2	EVAPORATION VOLUME .....	8
2.3	VALUE OF THE LOST WATER.....	10
2.4	AVAILABLE METHODS FOR REDUCING EVAPORATION.....	11
2.4.1	SHADING MATERIALS	12
2.4.2	FLOATING COVERS & OBJECTS	12
2.4.3	POLYACRYLAMIDE	14
2.4.4	CHEMICAL COVERS - MONOLAYERS	14
2.4.5	BIOLOGICAL COVERS	17
2.4.6	UNUSUAL METHODS EMPLOYED IN OTHER COUNTRIES	17
2.4.7	DESIGN FEATURES	18
2.4.8	PIPELINES	18
2.5	POTENTIAL COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH WATER SAVING S .....18	18
2.6	MONOLAYER CHEMICALS .....	19
2.6.1	WATERSAVR™	19
2.6.2	AQUATAIN	20
2.6.3	ES300	20
2.6.4	EMULSIONS OF CETYL AND STEARYL ALCOHOLS	21
2.7	AUSTRALIAN MONOLAYER FIELD TRIALS .....	22
2.8	ISSUES IN THE USE OF MONOLAYERS .....	22
2.8.1	MONOLAYER EFFECTIVENESS IN THE LABORATORY	22
2.8.2	MONOLAYER EFFECTIVENESS IN THE FIELD	23
2.8.3	BIOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	23
2.8.4	LONGEVITY IN THE FIELD	24
2.8.5	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	24
2.8.6	HUMAN HEALTH IMPACTS	24
2.8.7	MONOLAYER NATURAL EXPANSION RATE	25
2.8.8	WIND & WAVES	27
2.8.9	TURBULENCE	29
2.8.10	OBSTRUCTIONS TO MONOLAYER MOVEMENT	32
2.8.11	APPLICATION OF MONOLAYERS TO RUNNING WATER	35
2.9	FIELD TRIALS.....	36
2.9.1	FIELD TRIAL SITE	36
2.9.2	CALCULATING BASE SEEPAGE & LEAKAGE	37
2.9.3	STATIC TRIALS	38
2.9.4	WIND MEASUREMENTS AT VARYING HEIGHTS	39

2.9.5	FLOWING TRIALS	41
2.10	OTHER CURRENT RESEARCH.....	44
2.11	CONCLUSIONS.....	44
3	DEVELOPMENT OF THE DECISION SUPPORT MODEL.....	46
3.1	PRELIMINARY CHANNEL CHARACTERISATION .....	47
3.2	SEASONAL EVAPORATION .....	54
3.3	AVAILABLE WIND INFORMATION.....	56
3.4	MONOLAYER EXPANSION UNDER VARYING WIND CONDITIONS .....	60
3.4.1	MONOLAYER EXPANSION NO WIND	60
3.4.2	MONOLAYER EXPANSION – WIND BETWEEN 0 AND 3.2 KM/HR	63
3.4.3	MONOLAYER EXPANSION – WIND > 3.2 KM/HR AND PARALLEL TO CHANNEL DIRECTION	65
3.4.4	MONOLAYER EXPANSION – WIND > 3.2 KM/HR AND OPPOSITE TO CHANNEL DIRECTION	68
3.4.5	IMPACT ON MONOLAYER OF WIND OBLIQUE TO CHANNEL DIRECTION	71
3.4.6	IMPACT ON MONOLAYER OF WIND PERPENDICULAR TO CHANNEL DIRECTION	73
3.4.7	WIND > 25KM/HR	74
3.4.8	SUMMARY OF WIND CONDITIONS EXPERIENCED BY GMID CHANNELS	75
3.4.9	SUMMARY OF WIND CATEGORIES USED FOR MODEL	77
3.4.10	DURATION OF WIND EVENTS AND THE POSSIBLE IMPACTS	79
3.4.11	CHANNEL CHARACTERISATION PROCESS – FLOW CHART	81
3.5	IMPACT OF OBSTACLES .....	82
3.6	EFFICACY OF MONOLAYERS IN THE FIELD.....	85
3.7	ADDITIONAL PRODUCT INFORMATION.....	85
3.8	MODEL DESCRIPTION .....	86
3.9	CONCLUSIONS.....	87
4	RESULTS & DISCUSSION .....	89
4.1	EXAMPLE RESULTS – AVERAGE TRUNK CHANNEL.....	89
4.1.1	DAILY MONOLAYER MATERIAL REQUIREMENT	89
4.1.2	DAILY SAVINGS ACHIEVED	91
4.1.3	\$/ML COST OF WATER SAVINGS ACHIEVED – AVERAGE WIND CONDITIONS	93
4.1.4	\$/ML COST OF ACHIEVING WATER SAVINGS – DETAILED WIND CONDITIONS	95
4.1.5	PERIOD OF TIME FOR WHICH PARTICULAR ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS EXIST	100
4.1.6	TOTAL VOLUME OF SAVING THAT CAN BE ACHIEVED	101
4.1.7	TOTAL COST OF ACHIEVING SAVINGS	103
4.1.8	ACHIEVING SAVINGS AT REQUIRED \$/ML THRESHOLD	106
4.2	RESULTS – OTHER CHANNEL TYPES .....	108
4.2.1	SUMMARY OF RESULTS – TRUNK, CARRIER & SPUR CHANNELS	108
4.2.2	SUMMARY OF RESULTS – 25% LONGEST CARRIER, TRUNK & SPUR CHANNELS	108

4.2.3	SUMMARY OF RESULTS – 10% LONGEST CARRIER, TRUNK & SPUR CHANNELS	108
4.2.4	SUMMARY OF RESULTS – 1% LONGEST CARRIER, TRUNK & SPUR CHANNELS	108
4.3	SUMMARY OF RESULTS – ALL CHANNEL TYPES.....	108
4.4	MONOLAYERS COMPARED TO OTHER TECHNIQUES OF SAVING EVAPORATION.....	119
5	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	120
5.1	SUMMARY OF WORK UNDERTAKEN.....	120
5.1.1	LITERATURE SURVEY	120
5.1.2	LABORATORY & FIELD TRIALS	121
5.1.3	MODEL DEVELOPMENT	122
5.2	CONCLUSIONS.....	123
5.3	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	124
5.3.1	AREAS OF FURTHER RESEARCH	124
5.3.2	APPLICATION BY GOULBURN-MURRAY WATER	126
6	REFERENCES.....	128
7	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	134
8	GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....	136
9	APPENDICES.....	139



