

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Water use on pastoral dairy farms in New Zealand:
An analysis of measurements, predictions, and
water footprinting**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Environmental Sciences
at the Institute of Agriculture and Environment



Massey University

Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Caleb David Higham

2017

Abstract

Current water use guidelines for pastoral dairy farms across New Zealand are based on a 1964 study suggesting 70 L per cow per day for stock drinking water (SDW) and 70 L per cow per day for milking parlour water (MPW) use. However, dairy cows and milking parlours have changed significantly over the last half century. This thesis combined detailed monitoring of water use on more than 100 farms in the Waikato, Manawatu, and Canterbury regions with predictive modelling to; set benchmarks for SDW and MPW, analyse temporal and spatial variations of water use for irrigated and non-irrigated dairy farms, and assess the likely impact of climate change on future water demand of pastoral dairy farms across New Zealand. Finally, the thesis applied and evaluated different water footprint methods (the Water Footprint Network method, the Stress-Weighted Water Footprint method, and the Availability WAter REmaining (AWARE) method) to assess the impact of dairy water use on local water resources across different regions of New Zealand. In particular, the effects of varying the accuracy of data sources (local verse global) and the scale of the analysis (regional verse catchment) on the water footprints were investigated.

From this study, in the Waikato region, the mean SDW is 60 L/cow per day and the mean MPW is 49 L/cow per day. In the Manawatu region, the mean SDW is 74 L/cow per day and the mean MPW is 50 L/cow per day. In the Canterbury region, the annual mean SDW is 28 L/cow per day and mean MPW is 64 L/cow per day. For the first time, leakage rates in the supply of SDW were estimated for pastoral dairy farm systems. Average leakage rates were estimated to be approximately 26% in the Waikato region, 47% in the Manawatu region, and 13% in the Canterbury region. Through climate change modelling requirements for

irrigation water were estimated to increase by 17-24%, with the largest increase in Canterbury. Approximately 99% of the volumetric (total volume of water used) water footprint (L/kg fat and protein corrected milk) is associated with the green (from rainfall) and blue (from surface water) water consumed in the growth of pasture and feed at the study farms.

The use of global data sources, as compared to the local data, resulted in underestimation of the volumetric green water footprint (L/kg FPCM) by 12 to 30%, and overestimation of the volumetric blue water footprint (L/kg FPCM) by 3 to 141% in the study regions. Likewise, the water footprint of dairy farming was found to vary markedly with the scale at which this analysis is conducted. The use of local data at a catchment scale gave the most reliable water footprints.

Overall, water use on New Zealand dairy farms has been demonstrated to be much more complex than simple, historic guidelines indicate. The water use values produced in this study can serve as updated industry and policy guidelines, as the industry addresses limits to water availability and future increases in water use requirements for stock drinking water on non-irrigated dairy farms associated with predicted climate change.

Acknowledgements

To my supervisors, co-authors, and guides; Mike Scarsbrook, Dave Horne, Ranvir Singh, Brent Clothier, Barbara Khun-Sherlock, and Sarah McLaren.

My sincere thanks to David Horne, for helping me and having robust discussion. To Mike Scarsbrook for always being there to have a quick chat. To Ranvir Singh, for your help with deciphering water footprinting. To Brent Clothier for your kind input, and sharp knowledge. To Barbara thanks for your help and patience.

Thanks to, Mum and Dad, Julia, Nathan and William, Fraser and Hannah, Nana and Mike, Nan and Grandad, Sue and Brett Cullen, and all my other relatives who offered support.

To the water team: David Burger, Tom Stephens, Justin Kitto, Marc Weeber, Shirley Hayward, and to Rick Pridmore; thank you for your support and banter throughout my thesis.

To other helpful hands and brains: Ben Fisher, Olivia Jordan, Talia Grala, Mallory Crookenden, Jennie Burke, John Roche, Sally-Anne Turner, Hemda Levy, Eric Kolver, Callum Eastwood, Susanne Meier, and Susan Stokes. Thanks for your help with reviewing, problem solving, table formatting, and support, all of which were greatly appreciated.

To Adam, Gemma, and Teika, for housing and entertaining me on my trips to Palmerston North.

Thanks to the DairyNZ academic committee for your help and support. Thanks to everyone in the DairyNZ Palmerston North team for your company and lunchtime banter.

To the dairy farmers who were involved in this research and to DairyNZ for funding this research through the Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord. Thank you to all the people that have helped me through this PhD. Whether directly or indirectly it has been appreciated.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1. General Introduction	1
1.1 Background and Justification	1
1.1.1 Regional Council policy related to water allocation	3
1.2 Research Objectives	7
1.3 Thesis Structure	8
1.4 References	10
CHAPTER 2. Literature Review.....	16
2.1 Literature Review Summary	16
2.2 Water Use on New Zealand Pasture-Based Dairy Farms.....	16
2.3 Cow Welfare and Wellbeing	20
2.4 Dairy Cow Drinking Water	20
2.4.1 Dairy cow water intake – pasture systems	23
2.4.2 Overseas dairy cow water intake.....	26
2.4.3 Drivers of water intake.....	27
2.4.4 Dairy cow water intake predictions for confinement systems	29
2.4.5 Dairy cow water intake predictions for pasture systems.....	32
2.4.6 Summary	39
2.5 Milking Parlour Water Use	40
2.5.1 Milking parlour types	40
2.5.2 Primary milk cooling	41

2.5.3	Plant washing	43
2.5.4	Pit and yard washing	44
2.5.5	Udder washing	44
2.5.6	Feed pads.....	45
2.5.7	Total milking parlour water use	46
2.5.8	Summary – milking parlour water use	48
2.6	Irrigation Water Use	49
2.6.1	Summary - irrigation	50
2.7	Water Footprint Methods	52
2.7.1	Water Footprint Network (WFN) method.....	53
2.7.2	Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) methodologies.....	56
2.7.3	Hydrological water footprinting method.....	58
2.7.4	The AWARE method water footprint	59
2.7.5	Spatial scale.....	60
2.7.6	Water footprinting of dairy farming in New Zealand	61
2.7.7	Summary – water footprinting	62
2.8	Literature Review Summary	62
2.9	References	63
CHAPTER 3. Water Use on Nonirrigated Pasture-Based Dairy Farms		72
3.1	Abstract	72
3.2	Introduction	73
3.3	Materials and Methodology.....	75

3.3.1	Farm description.....	75
3.3.2	Data collection	78
3.3.3	Data management and calculations.....	78
3.3.4	Statistical analyses	81
3.3.5	Water use models comparison and evaluation.....	83
3.4	Results	84
3.5	Discussion	95
3.6	Conclusions	99
3.7	Acknowledgements	99
3.8	References	100
CHAPTER 4. Water Use on Irrigated Pasture-Based Dairy Farms.....		107
4.1	Abstract	107
4.2	Introduction	108
4.3	Materials and Methodology.....	110
4.3.1	Data collection	111
4.3.2	Farm descriptions	111
4.3.3	Data management and calculations.....	114
4.3.4	Leakage adjustment.....	114
4.3.5	Statistical analyses	115
4.3.6	Partial least squares modelling.....	115
2.1	Results	118
4.3.7	Evaluation of water use model predictions	122

4.3.8	PLS regression models	124
4.4	Discussion	132
4.5	Conclusions and Recommendations.....	136
4.6	Acknowledgements	136
4.7	References	137
CHAPTER 5. Water use accounting for New Zealand dairy farms		141
5.1	Abstract	141
5.2	Introduction	142
5.3	Materials and Methodology.....	145
5.3.1	Farm systems, data sources, and data management	145
5.3.2	Irrigation water use	148
5.3.3	Water use modelling	149
5.3.4	Climate change scenarios.....	151
5.4	Results	155
5.5	Discussion	164
5.5.1	Current-day water use by the NZ dairy industry.....	164
5.5.2	Estimating irrigation water use	165
5.5.3	Water use by the dairy industry under climate change	166
5.6	Conclusions	168
5.7	Acknowledgements	169
5.8	References	169

CHAPTER 6. Quantification of the Water Footprint of Dairy Farming: the Effect of Water Footprint Methods, Data Sources, and Spatial Scale.....	173
6.1 Abstract	173
6.2 Introduction	175
6.3 Materials and Methodology.....	179
6.3.1 System analysed – location and details of study farms.....	179
6.3.2 Water footprint methods	185
6.3.3 Data sources and spatial scale	190
6.3.4 Global data sources	194
6.3.5 Local data sources	196
6.4 Results	199
6.4.1 Volumetric WF and its variation on farms.....	199
6.4.2 Effect of different water footprint methods	204
6.4.3 Effect of local and global data sources	209
6.4.4 Effect of spatial scale	216
6.5 Discussion	219
6.5.1 Evaluation of water footprint method	219
6.5.2 Appropriate data sources and spatial scales	221
6.6 Conclusion.....	224
6.7 References	225
CHAPTER 7. Conclusions and Recommendations	234
7.1 Implications and Future Research	241

7.2	References	243
	Appendices	244
	Appendix A	244
	Timeline of Events	244
	Appendix B	246
	DRC 16 forms	246

List of Tables

Table 2-1 New Zealand Dairy Production System Types (Ramsbottom et al., 2015).	18
Table 2-2 metabolic water volumes (Houpt, 1970)	22
Table 2-3. Published Dairy Cow Water Consumption Volumes (L/cow per d) in New Zealand	25
Table 2-4. Review of models for variables ¹ voluntary water intake (VWI) prediction in dairy farms.	30
Table 2-5 Water Use in the Milking Parlour.....	47
Table 2-6 Annual water allocation by region and primary use (Aqualinc, 2010). 51	
Table 3-1. Characteristics of dairy farms used for water-use analysis.	77
Table 3-2. List of farm variables used for water use modelling.	82
Table 3-3. Average monthly stock drinking water (SDW), corrected stock drinking water (cSDW ¹), leakage, milking parlour water use (MPW), and total water use (TW) on pasture-based dairy farms (n).....	85
Table 3-4. Partial least squared regression model ¹ equations (raw coefficients) for predicting corrected stock drinking water use (log ₁₀ cSDW) on pasture-based dairy farms (n = 22).	88
Table 3-5. Partial least squared regression models ¹ and polynomial regression model equations (raw coefficients) for predicting milking parlour water use (log ₁₀ MPW) on pasture-based dairy farms.....	89
Table 3-6. Partial least squared regression models ¹ and polynomial regression model equations (raw coefficients) for predicting total water use (log ₁₀ TW) on pasture-based dairy farms.	90

Table 3-7. Evaluation of models to predict corrected stock drinking water [cSDW ¹ ; cSDW Model 3, Castle and Thomas (1975), Dahlborn et al. (1998)], milking parlour water (MPW; MPW Model 3), and total water (TW; TW Model 3).	94
Table 4-1. Characteristics (SD in parentheses) of the dairy farms used for water use analysis.	113
Table 4-2. List of different farm variables used in the water use analysis.....	117
Table 4-3. Average 365-d and peak water use measurements (L/cow per day) for stock drinking water (SDW), corrected stock drinking water (cSDW), leakage, milking parlour water (MPW), total water (TW), and irrigation water (IW).	119
Table 4-4. Corrected stock drinking water ¹ (cSDW), milking parlour water (MPW), and total water ² (TW) model predictions compared with the measured or derived water use volumes on the irrigated and nonirrigated pasture-based dairy farms.....	123
Table 4-5. Partial least squared regression model equations (raw coefficients) for predicting corrected stock drinking water use (log ₁₀ cSDW) on irrigated pasture-based dairy farms (n = 4) ¹	126
Table 4-6. Partial least squared regression model equations (raw coefficients) for predicting milking parlour water use (log ₁₀ MPW) on irrigated pasture-based dairy farms (n = 12).....	127
Table 4-7. Partial least squared regression model equations (raw coefficients) for predicting total water use (log ₁₀ TW) on irrigated pasture-based dairy farms (n = 6).	128
Table 4-8. Partial least square regression model evaluation for irrigated farms.	130

Table 5-1. Average farm and climate variables ¹ by region for non-irrigating dairy farms.....	146
Table 5-2. Average farm and average climate variables ¹ for irrigating dairy farms.	147
Table 5-3. Average annual temperature change (°C) above the base average temperature for 1986-2005 under four different RCP ¹ climate change pathways (Ministry for the Environment, 2016).....	153
Table 5-4. Average annual rainfall change (%) from the base average rainfall for 1986-2005 under four different RCP ¹ climate change pathways (Ministry for the Environment, 2016).....	154
Table 5-5. Total number of cows on irrigating and non-irrigating farms, average water uses ¹ (L/cow per d) for irrigating and non-irrigating farms, and the amount of data collected in farm-years ²	156
Table 5-6. Water use estimates (1000 × m ³ /yr) for regions in New Zealand on dairy farms for milking parlour water use (MPW), corrected stock drinking water (cSDW), stock drinking water (SDW), irrigation water, total abstracted water, and the total consumed (evapotranspired) fraction of water.....	157
Table 5-7. Current (2010-2015) corrected stock drinking water volumes (1000 × m ³ /year) and under different climate change scenarios (RCP 2.6, 4.5, 6.0, and 8.5 ¹) at three time periods (2031-2050, 2081-2100, and 2101-2120).....	159
Table 5-8. Current (2010-2015) milking parlour water use volumes (1000 × m ³ /year) and under different climate change scenarios (RCP 2.6, 4.5, 6.0, and 8.5 ¹) at three time periods (2031-2050, 2081-2100, and 2101-2120).....	162

Table 5-9. Estimated current irrigation water requirements and future requirements under climate change scenario RCP 4.5 at for the period 2031-2050.	163
Table 6-1. Characteristics of selected dairy farms across different regions of New Zealand.....	183
Table 6-2. Summary of global and local data sources used in quantification of water footprints of study dairy farms across different regions of New Zealand.	192
Table 6-3. Estimates of green and blue consumptive water footprints (L/kg FPCM ¹) on the study dairy farms across different regions of New Zealand.	201
Table 6-4. Estimates of water footprint characterization factors (CFs) for the blue water scarcity index WS_{blue} (Hoekstra et al., 2011), the water stress index WSI (Ridoutt et al., 2010), and available minus water demand CF_{AWARE} (Boulay et al., 2017) for the study regions in New Zealand. Note relative ranks indicated in parentheses (1 representing the lowest).	202
Table 6-5. Estimates of water footprint characterization factors (CFs) for the blue water scarcity index WS_{blue} (Hoekstra et al., 2011), water stress index WSI (Ridoutt et al., 2010), and available minus water demand CF_{AWARE} (Boulay et al., 2017) for study catchment or water management zones in New Zealand. Note relative ranks indicated in parentheses (1 representing the lowest).	203
Table 6-6. Estimates of characterized blue water footprint of irrigated dairy farms across different regions of New Zealand. Note relative ranks indicated in parentheses (1 representing the lowest).	207
Table 6-7. Characterized blue water footprints on catchments of irrigated dairy farms. Note relative ranks indicated in parentheses (1 representing the lowest).	208

Table 6-8. Sensitivity of WS_{blue} (Hoekstra et al., 2011) and CF_{AWARE} (Boulay et al., 2017) and characterised blue water footprints of irrigated dairy farms to different environmental flow requirements (EFR) in different regions of New Zealand.....	215
Table 7-1. Annual mean, peak, and the average milking day demand ($AMDD^2$) water use values for the Waikato, Manawatu, and Canterbury regions.....	235

List of Figures

Figure 2-1. Monthly dry matter % of pasture at Scott Farm, a research farm in the Waikato region of New Zealand from 2006-2015 (C. Roach, DairyNZ, Hamilton, New Zealand, personal communication).....	34
Figure 2-2. Dry matter % of pasture at research farms in the Waikato (weekly measurements, diamonds), Manawatu (a range of intervals, circles), and Canterbury (fortnightly measurements; squares) regions of New Zealand from 1/06/2013 to 31/5/2015 (C. Roach, DairyNZ, Hamilton, New Zealand, personal communication; A. Clement, DairyNZ, Lincoln, New Zealand, personal communication; I. Tait, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, personal communication).....	35
Figure 2-3. Dry matter % in Moorepark, Ireland over two trial periods in the spring and summer of 2009 and 2010 (C. Wims, DairyNZ, Hamilton, New Zealand, personal communication).	36
Figure 2-4. Expected water intake through pasture eaten in a simplistic model of 14.7 kg of dry matter eaten per day.....	38
Figure 2-5. Schematic showing direct and indirect water use (Hoekstra et al., 2011)	54
Figure 3-1. Mean daily water use (●, circles) ± 1 SD (error bars) and count of farms contributing to the data (solid line, secondary axis) for (a) total water use (TW), (b) milking parlour water use (MPW), (c) stock drinking water (SDW), and (d) corrected stock drinking water (cSDW).....	86
Figure 3-2. Measured or derived mean water use (number of farms ≥5) versus predicted water use (dashed line of best fit) and solid 1:1 line for (a) corrected stock drinking water (cSDW) model 3 ($R^2 = 0.84$), (b) milking parlour water use	

(MPW) model 3 ($R^2 = 0.90$) (c) the model of Castle and Thomas (1975; $R^2 = 0.41$), and (d) the model of Dahlborn et al. (1998; $R^2 = 0.46$). WVI = voluntary water intake. 92

Figure 4-1. Average daily water use (L/cow per d; \pm SD), and the count of farms contributing to the data (solid line) for (a) stock drinking water (SDW) on nonirrigated farms, (b) SDW on irrigated farms, (c) corrected stock drinking water (cSDW) on nonirrigated farms and d) cSDW on irrigated farms. 120

Figure 4-2. Average daily water (L/cow per day; \pm SD), and the count of farms contributing to the data (solid line) for (a) milking parlour water use (MPW) on nonirrigated farms, (b) MPW on irrigated farms, (c) total water use (TW) on nonirrigated farms and (d) TW use on irrigated farms (error bars up to 1285 L/cow per d due to leaks truncated at 600 L/cow per day). 121

Figure 4-3. Partial Least Square regression loading plots (variables defined in Table 4-2) for (a) corrected stock drinking water (cSDW) model 2, (b) milking parlour water use (MPW) model 3 and (c) total water use (TW) model 3. 129

Figure 4-4. Measured or derived water use (number of farms ≥ 5) versus predicted water use (dashed line of best fit) and solid 1:1 line for (a) corrected stock drinking water (cSDW) model 3 ($R^2 = 0.77$), (b) milking parlour water use (MPW) model 3 ($R^2 = 0.90$), and (c) total water use (TW) model 3 ($R^2 = 0.72$). 131

Figure 5-1. Corrected stock drinking water use percent increases compared with current use (2010-2015; dots) for climate change scenario RCP 4.5 with three time periods; 2031-2050 (solid fill); 2081-2100 (diagonal stripes); and 2101-2120 (gridlines), and with total cow numbers (\blacklozenge) on the second axis. 160

Figure 6-1. Map of New Zealand, showing location of the study regions as the Canterbury region (diagonal lines), Manawatu region (squares), and Waikato region (solid fill). 181

Figure 6-2. Schematic of blue and green water flows on a pastoral dairy farm system..... 182

Figure 6-3. Local data volumetric blue water footprints (L/kg fat and protein corrected milk (FPCM)) for New Zealand (weighted average), Canterbury (irrigated), Manawatu (irrigated), Waikato (irrigated), Manawatu (non-irrigated), and Waikato (non-irrigated)..... 217

Figure 6-4. Local data characterised water footprints (L/kg fat and protein correct milk (FPCM)) for the Canterbury region and Canterbury management zones for the $WF_{II_{blue}}$ (blue), $WF_{Ridoutt}$ (orange), and WF_{AWARE} (grey) methods. 218

List of Abbreviations

ADD	Average daily demand
AMD	Availability minus demand
AWARE	Available WAater REMaining
Brd	Breed
CF	Characterisation factor
CowBail	Cow to bail ratio
cSDW	Corrected stock drinking water
DM	Dry matter
DM%	Dry matter %
DMI	Dry matter intake
EFR	Environmental flow requirements
ET	Evapotranspiration
ET_{blue}	Blue evapotranspiration/irrigation water
ET_c	Crop specific evapotranspiration
ET_{green}	Green evapotranspiration
ET_o	Reference evapotranspiration
Evap	Potential evapotranspiration
FPCM	Fat and protein corrected milk
IW	Irrigation water
JD	Julian day
K_c	Crop coefficient
LCA	Life cycle assessment
MAR	Mean annual runoff
MeanT	Average daily temperature
Milking	The number of milkings in a day
MilkSol	Milksolids
MilkVol	Milk volume
MinT	Minimum daily temperature
MPW	Milking parlour water
MY	Milk yield
Na	Sodium
NPS-FM	National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management
NSE	Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency
PBIAS	Percentage bias
PDD	Peak daily demand
P_{eff}	Effective precipitation
PKE	Palm kernel expeller
PLS	Partial Least Squares
Rad	Solar radiation
RCPs	Representative concentration pathways

RF	Rainfall
RMA	Resource Management Act
RMSE	Root mean square error
R_{nat}	Natural runoff
RSR	RMSE-observations standard deviation ratio
SDW	Stock drinking water
SRF	Strongly regulated flows
ST_e	Surface time equivalent
SU	Stock unit
T_{Max}	Maximum daily temperature
T_{Min}	Minimum daily temperature
TW	Total water/bore water
VF	Variation factor
VWI	Voluntary water intake
WA	Water availability
W_A^{blue}	Blue water availability
W_F^{blue}	Blue water footprint
W_{FI}^{blue}	Water footprint impact index
WFN	Water Footprint Network
W_S^{blue}	Blue water scarcity
WSI	Water stress index
WU	Water withdrawal
WULCA	Water use in Life Cycle Assessment