

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
LIST OF OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 APPLICATION OF THE WFD UNDER FURROW IRRIGATION SYSTEMS	2
1.3 SOLUTE MONITORING AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA.....	3
1.4 PROJECT AIMS.....	5
1.5 APPROACH.....	5
CHAPTER 2 – SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS OF WETTING FRONT DETECTORS AND LABORATORY STUDIES ON HYDRAULIC PROPERTIES OF WICK MATERIALS.....	6
2.1 INTRODUCTION	6
2.2 LABORATORY STUDIES, NUMERICAL APPROACH AND EMPIRICAL OBSERVATIONS	11
2.2.1 Laboratory studies.....	11
2.2.2 Numerical approaches.....	15
2.2.3 Empirical observations.....	17
2.3 FIELD STUDIES.....	19
2.3.1 Field site.....	19
2.3.2 WFD installations	20
2.3.3 Water applications	24
2.3.4 Measurements and monitoring.....	25
2.4 Statistical analyses	26
2.5 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	27

2.5.1 Laboratory data analyses.....	27
2.5.2 Field study results	34
2.6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47
CHAPTER 3 – DETERMINING THE LOCATION OF FULLSTOP AND TUBE DETECTORS FOR FURROW IRRIGATION	49
3.1 INTRODUCTION TO SHORT FURROW IRRIGATION	49
3.2 ASSESSMENT OF FULLSTOP AND TUBE DETECTOR PERFORMANCE UNDER FURROW IRRIGATION	52
3.2.1 Assessment of FullStop and tube wetting front detector sensitivities	52
3.3 ON-FARM EVALUATION OF TUBE AND FULLSTOP WETTING FRONT DETECTORS	66
3.4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	73
CHAPTER 4 – SOLUTE AND NUTRIENT MONITORING.....	75
4.1 INTRODUCTION	75
4.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	77
4.2.1 Lysimeter study.....	77
4.2.2 Commercial orchard study.....	78
4.2.3 Municipal sludge trial.....	80
4.3 RESULTS	81
4.3.1 Lysimeter trial.....	81
4.3.2 Commercial orchard trial	91
4.3.3 Municipal sludge trial	98
4.4 DISCUSSION	100
4.5 CONCLUSIONS.....	103
CHAPTER 5 – TRAINING PACKAGE	105
5.1 OVERVIEW	105
CHAPTER 6 – CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	107
6.1 TUBE DETECTOR DESIGN AND FILL MATERIALS	107
6.2 WFD POSITIONING IN FURROW IRRIGATION.....	107
6.3 SOLUTE MONITORING	109

6.4 FUTURE RESEARCH NEEDS	109
REFERENCES	111
APPENDICES	117

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Components of the FullStop wetting front detector.....	7
Figure 2.2 Components of a tube-shaped wetting front detector.....	8
Figure 2.3 Components of a hybrid wetting front detector.....	10
Figure 2.4 Schematic of the Controlled Outflow Cell assembly	14
Figure 2.5 Schematic of the Bruce-Klute diffusivity test.....	15
Figure 2.6 A schematic presentation of a 90-cm tube detector filled with a wick material and (a) 50 mm diameter contact material and (b) 200 mm diameter contact material placed on the opening of the tube and subjected to a drying process after saturating the wick in the column.....	18
Figure 2.7 An example of 90-cm-long tube detectors (TD90) filled with either DE or very fine sand installed in a plot at three depths (30, 60, 90 cm) from the soil surface, with 50 cm horizontal distance between each detector and the mouth of the tube (dashed line) indicating the depth of placement.....	20
Figure 2.8 Plane view showing the positioning of tensiometers, neutron probe access tube, Diviner 2000 probe access tube and 90-cm-long tube detector within a plot....	21
Figure 2.9 Diagram illustrating (a) the field layout of the hybrid wetting front detectors (HD) filled either with soil or very fine sand and installed at 3 depths (30, 60, 90 cm; dashed horizontal lines indicate the depth of placement) from the soil surface, with 50 cm horizontal distance between each hybrid and (b) funnel-shaped wetting front detectors (FS TM) filled with fine sand or Diatomaceous Earth filter material installed at 4 depths (15, 30, 45, and 60 cm; dashed horizontal lines indicate the depth of installations) from the soil surface, with 50 cm distance between funnel detectors.....	22
Figure 2.10 Plane view showing the positioning of the tensiometers, neutron probe access tube, Diviner 2000 probe access tube in (a) hybrid detector plots and (b) funnel-shaped detector plots	23
Figure 2.11 Measured water retention characteristics for (a) wick materials and (b) soil materials	29
Figure 2.12 Unsaturated hydraulic conductivity determined using the standard Bruce-Klute method (symbol) and Hydrus-2D simulated (lines) for (a) DE & D36 sand and (b) two soil samples	32

Figure 2.13 Linear regressions between water level in the tube and wick tension for DE & D36-sand using a 90-cm tube detector with (a) 200 mm diameter opening, and (b) 50 mm diameter opening	33
Figure 2.14 Tension equilibrium between the bulk soil and contact materials at 30 cm (a), 60 cm (b) and 90 cm (c) depths.....	35
Figure 2.15 Water level recorded in TD90 filled with DE (left) and tensiometer readings at (a) 30 cm, (b) 60 cm and (c) 90 cm; or D36 sand (right) and tensiometer readings at depths of (d) 30 cm, (e) 60 cm and (f) 90 cm (sprinkler irrigation)	38
Figure 2.16 Tube tension recorded with TD90 filled with DE (left) and tensiometer reading at (a) 30 cm, (b) 60 cm and (c) 90 cm; or filled with very fine sand (right) and tensiometer readings at depths of (d) 30 cm, (e) 60 cm and (f) 90 cm.....	41
Figure 3.1 Short furrow irrigation system (after ARC, 2006).....	50
Figure 3.2 Tube Detector activation (blue points) and wick suction pressures (WSP, kPa) recorded in response to rainfall for a TD 90 detector placed at 90 cm soil depth	54
Figure 3.3 Tube Detector activation (blue points) and wick suction pressures (WSP, kPa) recorded in response to rainfall for a TD60 detector placed at 60 cm soil depth.....	54
Figure 3.4 Tube Detector activation (blue points) and wick suction pressures (WSP, kPa) recorded in response to rainfall for a TD30 detector placed at 30 cm soil depth	55
Figure 3.5 Tube Detector activation (blue points) and wick suction pressures (WSP, kPa) recorded in response to rainfall for a TD30 detector placed at 30 cm soil depth	56
Figure 3.6a Soil A: Soil does not provide enough lateral movement for this wetted furrow spacing (after Yonts et al., 2003).....	58
Figure 3.6b Soil B: Good lateral water movement for this wetted furrow spacing (after Yonts et al., 2003).....	58
Figure 3.7 A cross-section of an ideal furrow wetting pattern (after Yonts et al., 2003).....	58
Figure 3.8 A cross-section of a TD installation transect. Tube Detectors of 60 and 90 cm length (TD60 and TD90) were installed 30cm apart at distances of 15, 45 and 75 cm from the furrow centre	59
Figure 3.9 Activation frequencies of the LS across the test furrow.....	61

Figure 3.10 Variation in suction pressure (SP; kPa) and water volume (WV; ml) collected in Tube Detectors placed across the test furrow	63
Figure 3.11 Relationship between (WV; ml) collected in Tube Detectors and suction pressure (SP; kPa) measured across the test furrow	65
Figure 3.12 Longitudinal section of a very slow furrow – advance stream too small (Waskom et al., 1994).....	65
Figure 3.13 Longitudinal section of an ideal infiltration pattern (Waskom et al., 1994).....	66
Figure 3.14 Seasonal changes in suction (kPa) as calculated from water volumes collected by 90cm long Tube Wetting Front Detectors (TD90) installed at 60 cm soil depth at the top (triangles) and bottom (squares) of the beds in furrow-irrigated maize fields of farmers (a) Kwinda, (b) Matsingane (c) Nethonzhe and (d) Singo.....	72
Figure 4.1 WFD installation in commercial orchards.....	79
Figure 4.2 Soil volumetric water content (VWC) as measured by the capacitance sensors at depths of 15, 30, 45, 60 and 80 cm for the three lysimeters.....	82
Figure 4.3 Capacitance sensor, SC and WFD EC as well as cumulative irrigation and precipitation over the season.....	83
Figure 4.4 Cumulative salt leaching and drainage water EC for the SL (left) and SCL18 (right) soils.....	84
Figure 4.5 NO ₃ ⁻ concentrations obtained from SCs and WFDs and cumulative N fertilizer additions over the growth season.....	85
Figure 4.6 Cumulative N leaching and NO ₃ ⁻ concentrations in the drainage water for the SL (left) and SCL18 (right) soils.....	87
Figure 4.7 SC EC and NO ₃ ⁻ values (left) and WFD EC and NO ₃ ⁻ values (right) for the SCL18 soil.....	88
Figure 4.8 Phosphate concentrations of water samples collected by WFDs throughout the season.....	89
Figure 4.9 Cumulative P leaching and P concentrations in the drainage water for the SL (left) and SCL18 (right) soils.....	90
Figure 4.10 Rainfall and irrigation quantities for the peach and plum orchards.....	91
Figure 4.11 Comparison of EC values measured in soil water samples collected by WFDs and SCs at depths of 30, 45 and 60 cm in the peach orchard.....	92

Figure 4.12 Comparison of EC values measured in soil water samples collected by wetting front detectors (WFDs) and suction cups (SCs) at depths of 30, 45 and 60 cm in the plum orchard.....	93
Figure 4.13 EC data for 30, 45 and 60 cm WFDs (above) and SCs (below) in the peach orchard.....	94
Figure 4.14 EC data for 30, 45 and 60 cm WFD (above) and SCs (below) in the plum orchard	95
Figure 4.15 Logged FullStop data for the peach (a), plum (b) and nectarine orchards for the 2008 growing season.....	96
Figure 4.16 WFD nitrate data for the peach (a), plum (b) and nectarine (c) orchards for 2008 growth season.....	97
Figure 4.17 EC of soil solution samples collected by the 0.3 m deep WFDs in a turfgrass sod field trial during the 2006 growing season.....	98
Figure 4.18 Nitrate concentration of soil solution samples collected by the 0.3 m deep WFDs in a turfgrass sod field trial during the 2006 growing season.....	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Particle size distribution.....	27
Table 2.2 Water retention model parameters.....	30
Table 2.3 Contact and bulk soil tensions (rainfall).....	36
Table 2.4 Paired t-test analysis between contact and soil tensions (sprinkler).....	37
Table 2.5 Summary of regression values for the relationship between water level and contact tension of the 3 tube lengths (rainfall).....	37
Table 2.6 Summary of regression values for the relationship between water level and contact tension of the three tube lengths (sprinkler irrigation).....	39
Table 2.7 Paired t-test analyses between the tube tension and tensiometer readings (cm).....	40
Table 2.8 Paired t-test analysis to discriminate between the tube lengths (evaluated on the basis of > 2 cm water level).....	43
Table 2.9 Paired t-test analyses to discriminate between the tube lengths (evaluated on the basis of > 4 cm water level).....	43
Table 2.10 Paired t-test analyses to determine the contribution of the wick materials used in the tubes to response differences (responses evaluated on the basis of > 2 cm and > 4 cm water level).....	44
Table 2.11 Paired t-test analysis responses between the two wick materials (hybrid detector).....	45
Table 2.12 Paired t-test analysis responses between the funnel-shaped with D.E and funnel-shaped with fine sand (D33).....	46
Table 2.13 Paired t-test analysis responses between the two designs.....	46
Table 3.1 Average number of responses recorded for FullStop (FS) and three Tube Detector (TD) versions (TD30, TD60, TD90) installed at three soil placement depths (30, 60 or 90 cm).....	56
Table 3.2 Activation frequency of Tube Detectors (TD) placed at different lateral distances from the furrow centre (15, 45 or 75 cm) after wetting events of more than 10 mm	62

Table 3.3 Suction pressures (SP) measured and water volumes (WV) collected from Tube Detectors (TD) placed at different lateral positions across the test furrow (distances of 15, 45 or 75 cm from the furrow centre).....	64
Table 3.4 FullStop (FS) responses to irrigation and rain in Farmer Matshingane’s field.....	68
Table 3.5 FullStop (FS) responses to irrigation and rain in Farmer Kwindi’s field.....	69
Table 3.6 Mean LongStop (LS) activation frequency to irrigation and rain in farmer fields.....	69