Petheram C, Watson I and Stone P (eds) (2013) Agricultural resource assessment for the Gilbert catchment. A report to the Australian Government from the CSIRO Flinders and Gilbert Agricultural Resource Assessment, part of the North Queensland Irrigated Agriculture Strategy. CSIRO Water for a Healthy Country and Sustainable Agriculture flagships, Australia. © CSIRO 2013

See <www.csiro.au/FGARA> for full report.

Appendix C

List of figures

Figure 1.1 Major dams (greater than 500 GL capacity), large irrigation areas and selected drainage divisions across Australia
Figure 1.2 Schematic diagram of key components and concepts in the establishment of a greenfield irrigation development
Figure 2.1 The Flinders and Gilbert catchments within the Gulf region of northern Australia10
Figure 2.2 The Gilbert catchment11
Figure 2.3 Soil sampling sites and airborne geophysical survey flight lines of the Gilbert catchment
Figure 2.4 Schematic representation of digital soil mapping method15
Figure 2.5 Availability of rainfall data availability in the Gilbert catchment16
Figure 2.6 Crop yield (peanuts) and applied irrigation water27
Figure 3.1 Schematic diagram of key natural components and concepts in the establishment of a greenfield irrigation development
Figure 3.2 Simplified surface geology of the Gilbert catchment
Figure 3.3 Map of soil generic group (SGG) classes for the Gilbert catchment41
Figure 3.4 Surface soil pH of the Gilbert catchment43
Figure 3.5 Minimum soil depth of the Gilbert catchment43
Figure 3.6 Surface texture of soils in the Gilbert catchment44
Figure 3.7 Soil permeability of the Gilbert catchment45
Figure 3.8 Plant available water capacity in the Gilbert catchment46
Figure 3.9 Electrical conductivity in the top 10 cm of soils of the Gilbert catchment47
Figure 3.10 Typical synoptic systems influencing the Gilbert catchment
Figure 3.11 Mean annual rainfall and potential evaporation under Scenario A49
Figure 3.12 Potential evaporation under Scenario A for the Gilbert catchment
Figure 3.13 Rainfall under Scenario A for the Gilbert catchment50
Figure 3.14 Rainfall deficit under Scenario A for the Gilbert catchment50
Figure 3.15 Rainfall and potential evaporation under Scenario A averaged across the Gilbert catchment51
Figure 3.16 Mean annual rainfall and potential evaporation averaged over the Gilbert catchment52
Figure 3.17 Rainfall variability around Australia under Scenario A53
Figure 3.18 Runs of wet and dry years in the Gilbert catchment54
Figure 3.19 Percentage change in mean annual rainfall under Scenario C relative to Scenario A55
Figure 3.20 Spatial distribution of mean annual rainfall across the Gilbert catchment under scenarios Cwet, Cmid and Cdry

Figure 3.21 Mean monthly rainfall and potential evaporation for the Gilbert catchment under scenarios A and C	56
Figure 3.22 Schematic diagram of terrestrial water balance in the Gilbert catchment	57
Figure 3.23 Major aquifers of the Gilbert catchment	58
Figure 3.24 Schematic cross-section highlighting the connectivity between aquifers of the Carpentaria and Karumba basins of the Great Artesian Basin	59
Figure 3.25 Groundwater salinity in the Gilbert catchment with the recharge area of the Great Artesian Basin and the location of airborne electromagnetic flight lines shown in Figure 3.26 and Figure 3.27	60
Figure 3.26 Satellite image and conductivity-depth section for flight line 20070	61
Figure 3.27 Map of mean annual groundwater recharge in the Gilbert catchment under Scenario A	63
Figure 3.28 Likelihood of groundwater inflow at river and pool sampling sites in the Gilbert catchment	65
Figure 3.29 Main rivers and streamflow gauging stations of the Gilbert catchment	66
Figure 3.30 Change in catchment area along the Gilbert River from Gilberton	67
Figure 3.31 Change in catchment area along the Einasleigh River from the confluence of the Einasleigh River and Bundock Creek	67
Figure 3.32 Mean annual rainfall and runoff across the Gilbert catchment under Scenario A	68
Figure 3.33 Map showing 20%, 50% (median) and 80% exceedance annual runoff across the Gilbert catchment under Scenario A	68
Figure 3.34 Runoff in the Gilbert catchment under Scenario A	69
Figure 3.35 Gilbert River downstream of Rockfields streamflow gauging station (October 2012)	69
Figure 3.36 Median annual streamflow (i.e. 50% exceedance) in the Gilbert catchment	72
Figure 3.37 20% and 80% exceedance of annual streamflow in the Gilbert catchment	72
Figure 3.38 Flood inundation map of the Gilbert catchment	74
Figure 3.39 Spatial extent and temporal variation of inundation during simulated flood events of (a) 2001, (b) 2008, (c) 2009 and (d) 2011	75
Figure 3.40 Instream waterhole evolution	76
Figure 3.41 Location of key aquatic refugia identified in the Gilbert catchment	77
Figure 4.1 Schematic diagram of key components of the living and built environment to be considered in the establishment of a greenfield irrigation development	80
Figure 4.2 Gilbert River	83
Figure 4.3 Fish distribution in the Gilbert catchment	85
Figure 4.4 Saw-shelled turtle captured in the Gilbert catchment	86
Figure 4.5 Example of a typically clear waterhole in the Einasleigh River, Gilbert catchment	88
Figure 4.6 Status of regional ecosystem biodiversity for the Gilbert catchment	91
Figure 4.7 Spatial representation of important ecological assets across the Gilbert catchment	93
Figure 4.8 Photographic collage of early colonial mining on the Etheridge goldfields (Lees, 1899)	96
Figure 4.9 Current native title determinations and applications in the Gilbert catchment	98
Figure 4.10 Indigenous land use agreements and Indigenous-controlled pastoral leases in the Gilbert catchment	99
Figure 4.11 Total live cattle export from Australia, September 1992 to September 20121	12

Figure 4.12 Current mining and mineral exploration and development leases in the Gilbert catchment113
Figure 4.13 Petroleum, geothermal and coal exploration licences in the Gilbert catchment
Figure 4.14 Downstream face of Kidston Dam (officially known as Copperfield River Gorge Dam) on the Copperfield River
Figure 4.15 Multi-combination vehicles116
Figure 4.16 Queensland infrastructure map showing accessibility of heavy vehicles, ports and railways in Queensland and the Gilbert catchment
Figure 4.17 Gilbert catchment infrastructure map showing accessibility of heavy vehicles, ports, railways and high voltage powerlines
Figure 5.1 Schematic diagram of key engineering and agricultural components to be considered in the establishment of a greenfield irrigation development
Figure 5.2 Schematic diagram of an embankment dam131
Figure 5.3 DamSite model results for the Gilbert catchment overlain on transparent geology and shaded relief map134
Figure 5.4 Mount Noble range looking upstream along Einasleigh River
Figure 5.5 Cost of water in \$/ML versus cumulative divertible yield at 85% annual time reliability139
Figure 5.6 Kidston Dam looking upstream141
Figure 5.7 Dam cross-section, height, volume and reservoir surface area for Kidston Dam
Figure 5.8 Raised Kidston Dam extent of inundation and property boundaries (indicated by coloured shading)
Figure 5.9 Annual time reliability and volumetric reliability for Kidston Dam under scenarios A and C143
Figure 5.10 Comparisons of inundated area with and without the raising of Kidston Dam under Scenario A143
Figure 5.11 Regional ecosystems inundated by the raised Kidston Dam reservoir at full supply level144
Figure 5.12 Dagworth potential dam site, looking upstream145
Figure 5.13 Dam cross-section, height, volume and reservoir surface area for Dagworth dam site146
Figure 5.14 Dagworth dam depth of inundation and property boundaries (indicated by coloured shading)146
Figure 5.15 Annual time reliability and volumetric reliability for Dagworth dam under scenarios A and C147
Figure 5.16 Comparisons of inundated area with and without the construction of Dagworth dam under Scenario A147
Figure 5.17 Regional ecosystems inundated by the potential Dagworth dam reservoir at full supply level.148
Figure 5.18 Green Hills upstream potential dam site, looking upstream
Figure 5.19 Dam cross-section, height, volume and reservoir surface area for Green Hills potential dam site
Figure 5.20 Green Hills upstream potential dam depth of inundation and property boundaries (indicated by coloured shading)
Figure 5.21 Annual time reliability and volumetric reliability for Green Hills dam under scenarios A and C151
Figure 5.22 Comparisons of inundated area with and without construction of Green Hills dam under Scenario A152
Figure 5.23 Regional ecosystem inundated by the potential Green Hills dam reservoir at full supply level.152
Figure 5.24 Schematic diagram of sheet piling weir

Figure 5.25 Ring tank in the Flinders catchment	.156
Figure 5.26 Annual volume of streamflow extracted versus annual time reliability for streamflow gauge 917111A	157
Figure 5.27 Annual volume of streamflow extracted versus annual time reliability for streamflow gauge 917001D	157
Figure 5.28 Annual volume of streamflow extracted versus annual time reliability for streamflow gauge 917102A	158
Figure 5.29 Annual volume of streamflow extracted versus annual time reliability for streamflow gauge 917107A	158
Figure 5.30 Land suitability map for offstream water storages in the Gilbert catchment	.160
Figure 5.31 Reported conveyance losses from irrigation systems across Australia (ANCID, 2001)	.165
Figure 5.32 Efficiency of different types of irrigation systems	.166
Figure 5.33 Probability of crop yield potential for dryland and fully irrigated mungbean sown in Georgetown climate on 15 February	176
Figure 5.34 Probability of crop yield potential for dryland and fully irrigated sorghum (grain) sown in Georgetown climate on 15 January	176
Figure 5.35 Probability of crop yield potential for dryland and fully irrigated cotton sown in Georgetown climate on 15 January	176
Figure 5.36 Crop yield plotted against applied irrigation water in Georgetown climate	.178
Figure 5.37 Applied irrigation water for planting on the 15th day of each month for sorghum (grain) at Georgetown	182
Figure 5.38 Crop yield for planting on the 15th day of each month for sorghum (grain) at Georgetown	.183
Figure 5.39 The area associated with each land suitability class for a selection of 14 crops in the Gilbert catchment	186
Figure 5.40 Modelled land suitability for sorghum (grain). Note that this land suitability map does not take into consideration flooding, risk of secondary salinisation or availability of water	188
Figure 5.41 Sorghum (grain)	.188
Figure 5.42 Modelled land suitability for mungbean. Note that this land suitability map does not take into consideration flooding, risk of secondary salinisation or availability of water	191
Figure 5.43 Mungbean	.191
Figure 5.44 Modelled land suitability for Rhodes grass and sorghum (forage). Note that this land suitability map does not take into consideration flooding, risk of secondary salinisation or availability of water.	195
Figure 5.45 Bambatsi	
Figure 5.46 Modelled land suitability for lablab and lucerne. Note that this land suitability map does not take into consideration flooding, risk of secondary salinisation or availability of water	
Figure 5.47 Lablab	198
Figure 5.48 Modelled land suitability for cotton. Note that this land suitability map does not take into consideration flooding, risk of secondary salinisation or availability of water	202
Figure 5.49 Cotton	202
Figure 5.50 Modelled land suitability for sugarcane. Note that this land suitability map does not take int	0
consideration flooding, risk of secondary salinisation or availability of water	.205

Figure 5.51 Sugarcane
Figure 5.52 Modelled land suitability for sweet corn and tomato. Note that this land suitability map does not take into consideration flooding, risk of secondary salinisation or availability of water
Figure 5.53 Sweet corn
Figure 5.54 Modelled land suitability for cassava and peanuts. Note that this land suitability map does not take into consideration flooding, risk of secondary salinisation or availability of water
Figure 5.55 Peanuts
Figure 5.56 Modelled land suitability for mango and Indian sandalwood. Note that this land suitability map does not take into consideration flooding, risk of secondary salinisation or availability of water214
Figure 5.57 Indian sandalwood214
Figure 5.58 Modelled land suitability for mango and Indian sandalwood. Note that this land suitability map does not take into consideration flooding, risk of secondary salinisation or availability of water218
Figure 5.59 Mangoes
Figure 6.1 Schematic diagram of key components and concepts in the establishment of a greenfield irrigation development
Figure 6.2 Growth patterns of beef cattle in northern Australia
Figure 6.3 Land tenure in the Gilbert catchment
Figure 7.1 Schematic diagram of key components and concepts in the establishment of a greenfield irrigation development
Figure 7.2 Steady-state watertable level for (a) various recharge rates and hydraulic conductivities (K) and (b) an irrigation area of 100 ha, at varying distances to the river
Figure 7.3 Steady-state watertable level for an irrigation area of 1000 ha, plotted against distance to the river
Figure 7.4 Steady-state watertable level at varying distances to the river for an irrigation area of (a) 250 ha and (b) 500 ha
Figure 7.5 Steady-state watertable level at varying distances (d) to the river for (a) an irrigation area of 1000 ha and (b) various irrigation area and distance combinations
Figure 7.6 Watertable level for various aquifer diffusivities (D) and distances to river (d), for an irrigation area of 100 ha and recharge rate of 100 mm/year259
Figure 7.7 Flux response for different aquifer diffusivities, for different hydraulic conductivities (K), specify yields (Sy) and distances to river (d)260
Figure 7.8 Variation in watertable level beneath two neighbouring 500-ha irrigation developments at different distances of separation
Figure 7.9 Conductivity–depth section (lower panel) for flight line 10090. Location of flight line on a satellite image is shown in upper panel. This flight line transects the Gilbert River and Etheridge River downstream of Georgetown
Figure 8.1 Schematic diagram illustrating the components of the case study for a dam and irrigation development near Green Hills station
Figure 8.2 (a) Satellite map and (b) relief and flood map of the area surrounding Green Hills dam276
Figure 8.3 (a) Soil generic group map and (b) land suitability map of the area surrounding the Green Hills site for spray-irrigated cotton
Figure 8.4 Landscape near the potential Green Hills dam irrigation development279
Figure 8.5 (a) Monthly rainfall and (b) monthly potential evaporation under Scenario A at Green Hills280

Figure 8.6 (a) Maximum monthly temperature and (b) minimum monthly temperature under Scenario A at Green Hills
Figure 8.7 Annual streamflow on the Gilbert River at the Green Hills dam site under Scenario A
Figure 8.8 Crop yield versus applied irrigation water under Scenario A for (a) cotton, (b) peanuts and (c) sorghum (forage)
Figure 8.9 Mean annual applied irrigation water supplied to the field in (a) cotton, (c) peanuts and (e) sorghum (forage) in ML, and (b) cotton, (d) peanuts and (f) sorghum (forage) in ML/ha, under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam
Figure 8.10 (a) Median annual applied irrigation water supplied to the field and (b) percentage of years that the maximum area is planted under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam
Figure 8.11 (a) Ratio of evaporation from the reservoir to the applied irrigation water and (b) percentage of time the volume of the reservoir is less than 20% of the full supply level volume under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam
Figure 8.12 Median annual streamflow quotient at (a) gauge 917001D and (b) gauge 917009A for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam292
Figure 8.13 (a) Cotton, (c) peanuts and (e) sorghum (forage) median of the 30-year mean (M30M) values for crop yield, and (b) cotton, (d) peanuts and (f) sorghum (forage) M30M values for specific yield, under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam
Figure 8.14 (a) Median of the 30-year mean (M30M) values for gross margin and (b) M30M values for gross margin per hectare under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam
Figure 8.15 (a) Median of the 30-year net present values and (b) standard deviation of the 30-year net present values under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam296
Figure 8.16 (a) Median of the 30-year farm-scale net present values and (b) standard deviation of the 30-year farm-scale net present values under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam
Figure 8.17 Gross margins for cotton under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam, with a scheme area of 12,000 ha and crop area decision of 4 ML/ha: (a) time series and (b) box plot
Figure 8.18 Gross margins for peanuts under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam, with a scheme area of 12,000 ha and crop area decision of 4 ML/ha: (a) time series and (b) box plot
Figure 8.19 Gross margins for sorghum (forage) under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam, with a scheme area of 12,000 ha and crop area decision of 4 ML/ha: (a) time series and (b) box plot
Figure 8.20 Combined gross margins for cotton, peanuts and sorghum (forage) under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam, with a scheme area of 12,000 ha and crop area decision of 4 ML/ha: (a) time series and (b) box plot
Figure 8.21 Percentage exceedance plots of (a) net present value and (b) internal rate of return under Scenario B for the scheme-scale 12,000-ha irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam301
Figure 8.22 Percentage exceedance plots of (a) net present value and (b) internal rate of return under Scenario B for the farm-scale 12,000-ha irrigation development associated with the Green Hills dam302
Figure 8.23 Change in depth to watertable for different values of saturated hydraulic conductivity (K): (a) lower recharge rate of 120 mm/year and (b) higher recharge rate of 200 mm/year

Figure 9.1 Schematic diagram illustrating the components of the case study for the irrigation developments associated with Green Hills and Dagworth dams
Figure 9.2 (a) Satellite image and (b) relief map area surrounding Green Hills and Dagworth dams
Figure 9.3 Photo of the landscape near the potential Green Hills dam irrigation development317
Figure 9.4 (a) Soil generic group map and (b) land suitability map for the middle reaches of the Gilbert and Einasleigh rivers for spray-irrigated sugarcane
Figure 9.5 (a) Monthly rainfall and (b) monthly potential evaporation, under Scenario A at Dagworth319
Figure 9.6 (a) Maximum monthly temperature and (b) minimum monthly temperature, under Scenario A at Dagworth
Figure 9.7 Annual streamflow on the Gilbert River at the Green Hills dam site under Scenario A
Figure 9.8 Annual streamflow on the Einasleigh River at the Dagworth dam site under Scenario A
Figure 9.9 Crop yield versus applied irrigation water under Scenario A for sugarcane for a sand or loam over relatively friable clay subsoil
Figure 9.10 (a) Mean annual total applied irrigation water supplied to the field (ML) and (b) ML applied per hectare under Scenario B for the irrigation developments associated with Green Hills and Dagworth dams
Figure 9.11 Ratio of evaporation from the reservoir to the applied irrigation water under Scenario B for (a) Green Hills dam and (b) Dagworth dam
Figure 9.12 Percentage of time the volume of the reservoir is less than 20% of the full supply level volume under Scenario B for (a) Green Hills dam and (b) Dagworth dam
Figure 9.13 Median streamflow quotient at (a) Green Hills dam (gauge 917001D) and (b) Dagworth dam (virtual gauge 355)
Figure 9.14 (a) Median of the 30-year mean (M30M) values for crop yield and (b) standard deviation of the 30-year mean values (S30M) for crop yield, under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Green Hills and Dagworth dams. Circles in (a) correspond with lines in Figure 9.15331
Figure 9.15 Crop yield from the combined scheme area under Scenario B for three different scheme areas marked in Figure 9.14a
Figure 9.16 (a) Median of the 30-year mean values (M30M) for specific yield and (b) percentage of time 2 million t of sugarcane is exceeded under Scenario B for the irrigation developments associated with the Green Hills and Dagworth dams
Figure 9.17 (a) Median of the 30-year mean (M30M) values for crop gross margin and (b) M30M values for gross margin per hectare under Scenario B for the irrigation developments associated with the Green Hills and Dagworth dams
Figure 9.18 a) Median of the 30-year mean (M30M) values for scheme-scale net present value and (b) standard deviation of the 30-year mean (S30M) values for scheme-scale net present value under Scenario B for the irrigation developments associated with the Green Hills and Dagworth dams
Figure 9.19 Median of the 30-year mean values for farm-scale net present values and (b) standard deviation of the 30-year mean values for farm-scale net present value, under Scenario B for the irrigation developments associated with the Green Hills and Dagworth dams
Figure 9.20 Gross margins for sugarcane (\$/ha) under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with Green Hills dam: (a) time series and (b) box plot
Figure 9.21 Gross margins for sugarcane (\$/ha) under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with Dagworth dam: (a) time series and (b) box plot

Figure 9.22 Percentage exceedance plots of (a) net present value and (b) internal rate of return under Scenario B for the scheme-scale irrigation development of 16,000 ha associated with the Green Hills dam
Figure 9.23 Percentage exceedance plots of net present value, under Scenario B for the scheme-scale irrigation development of 16,000 ha associated with the Dagworth dam
Figure 9.24 Percentage exceedance plots of (a) net present value and (b) internal rate of return under Scenario B for the farm-scale irrigation development of 16,000 ha associated with the Green Hills dam340
Figure 9.25 Percentage exceedance plots of (a) net present value and (b) internal rate of return under Scenario B for the farm-scale irrigation development of 16,000 ha associated with the Dagworth dam340
Figure 9.26 Change in depth to watertable for different values of saturated hydraulic conductivity (K): (a) low recharge rate 130 mm/year and (b) high recharge rate of 215 mm/year
Figure 10.1 Schematic diagram illustrating the components of the case study for an irrigation development associated with Kidston Dam
Figure 10.2 (a) Satellite image and (b) relief map of the area surrounding Kidston Dam352
Figure 10.3 (a) Soil generic group map and (b) land suitability map of the area surrounding Kidston Dam for spray-irrigated Rhodes grass
Figure 10.4 Landscape of the potential Kidston Dam irrigation development
Figure 10.5 Conductivity-depth section (lower panel) for flight line 20060
Figure 10.6 Conductivity-depth section (lower panel) for flight line 20070
Figure 10.7 (a) Monthly rainfall and (b) monthly potential evaporation under Scenario A at Einasleigh357
Figure 10.8 (a) Maximum monthly temperature and (b) minimum monthly temperature under Scenario A at Einasleigh
Figure 10.9 Annual streamflow at the Kidston Dam under Scenario A
Figure 10.10 Crop yield versus applied irrigation water under Scenario A for Rhodes grass hay in the Einasleigh area
Figure 10.11 Mean annual applied irrigation water supplied to the crop in (a) ML and (b) ML/ha equivalent under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Kidston Dam
Figure 10.12 Median annual applied irrigation water supplied to the crop under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Kidston Dam
Figure 10.13 (a) Ratio of evaporation from the reservoir to the applied irrigation water and (b) percentage of time the volume of the reservoir is less than 20% of the full supply level volume under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Kidston Dam
Figure 10.14 Median streamflow quotient at (a) gauge 917106A and (b) gauge 917009A under or the irrigation development associated with the Kidston Dam
Figure 10.15 (a) Median of the 30-year mean values (M30M) for crop yield and (b) standard deviation of the 30-year mean values (S30M) for crop yield under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Kidston Dam
Figure 10.16 Crop yield from the total scheme area under Scenario B for three different scheme areas367
Figure 10.17 (a) Median of the 30-year mean values (M30M) for specific yield and (b) standard deviation of the 30-year mean values (S30M) for specific yield under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Kidston Dam
Figure 10.18 (a) Median of the 30-year mean values (M30M) for gross margin per hectare and (b) median of the 30-year mean values (M30M) for gross margin under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Kidston Dam

Figure 10.19 (a) Median of the 30-year mean values (M30M) for net present value and (b) standard deviation of the 30-year mean values (S30M) for net present value under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Kidston Dam	59
Figure 10.20 (a) Median of the 30-year mean values (M30M) for net present value and (b) standard deviation of the 30-year mean values (S30M) for net present value under Scenario B for the irrigation development associated with the Kidston Dam	70
Figure 10.21 Gross margins for Rhodes grass under Scenario B for the irrigation site associated with the Kidston Dam, with a scheme area of 1000 ha: (a) time series and (b) box plots	71
Figure 10.22 Percentage exceedance plots for (a) net present value and (b) internal rate of return under Scenario B for the scheme-scale irrigation development of 1000 ha associated with Kidston Dam	72
Figure 10.23 Percentage exceedance plots of net present value under Scenario B for the farm-scale irrigation development of 1000 ha associated with the Kidston Dam	73
Figure 10.24 Change in depth to watertable for different values of saturated hydraulic conductivity (K): (a) low recharge rate of 135 mm/year and (b) high recharge rate of 215 mm/year	74