

Evaluation of Alternative Policies of Irrigation Water Price. Application to Large Farms in Alentejo Region

Noéme, C.

Instituto Superior de Agronomia, Universidade Técnica de Lisboa, Departamento de Economia e Sociologia Rural - Tapada da Ajuda, 1349-017 Lisboa Portugal, noeme@isa.utl.pt;

Fragoso, R.

Universidade de Évora, Departamento de Gestão de Empresas - Largo dos Colegiais 7800 Évora Portugal, rfragoso@uevora.pt; (P)

Abstract:

Irrigation is economically important in many regions of Mediterranean Europe such as the Portuguese region of Alentejo. The new Water Law proposed by the European Commission points out that water management might be based on the principle of payment by users. These issues have some effect on the cost pattern of the farmers, when considering the water cost. However, the implementation of water tariff policies can provide a very important policy instrument in order to promote an efficient use of water in the agricultural sector as well as to avoid, at least partially, the loss of farm incomes. The main objective of this study is to evaluate the effects of alternative policies of water price for irrigation in the farm income and the production pattern, having in account the recovery of the public investment and the operating costs with irrigation infrastructures. The methodology used is based on the estimate of farm water demand and on the determination of the investment and the current costs of the irrigation infrastructures. This study was applied to irrigated areas of Odivelas, in the South of Portugal.

Key Words: Price of Water; Irrigation; Alentejo; Mathematical Programming

1. Introduction

Throughout history, water has been considered an inexhaustible resource, and therefore free. The availability of water for agricultural, industrial and urban uses was guaranteed on the basis of social criteria. The Industrial Revolution of the 19th century, the population growth, the economic development and the urban concentration, brought about a growing need for water.

To satisfy the needs, there were made great public investments in infrastructures for the storage and distribution of water. This policy was very important for economic growth itself, as seen in the 20th century, but it was based on the increase of water offer, thus leading to an indiscriminate increase in demand. In consequence, there was a rapid increase in the opportunity cost of the investments in water infrastructures, as also a degradation of the environment.

The increase of the opportunity cost in the new investments is related to the increasing scarcity of water resources, which gives rise to competition between the different alternative uses (Ohlsson, 1995). The intensive use of water with the objective of increasing agricultural productivity, intensifies industrial growth and satisfy the needs of the urban concentration, has

had adverse effects on the environment, such as the salination of soils and the excessive use of water. The need to preserve the quality of the water and the growing value of water in certain non-consumption uses, such as recreational, ecological and landscape enhancement, has gradually given rise to economic criteria in the management of water and in the allocation of water resources amongst different uses.

The increasing pressure on the demand for water quality and the compromises assumed in international agreements about the environmental policy lead the European Parliament to approve the Water Law (2000/60/EC) which establishes a new framework in the field of water policy.

The Water Law establishes that the costs of the water management services for the different uses should be necessarily defined by 2010 (Art. 9). For this purpose, an economic study should be made on the use of water in each Member State, taking into consideration the total water costs, including the environmental and scarcity costs. The methodology to be used should take into account the principle of the user - payer, and furthermore the definition of the measures that bring about the best cost / efficiency relationship for the different uses of water.

A resource has an economic value if its users are willing to pay a price for its use. According to Blanco (1999), the economic value of the water is not the only value. Prices vary in a sectorial, regional and individual level. In general, agriculture is the economic sector where most of the water is consumed and it is also the sector where the lowest price is practised. The definition of some goals would contribute to obtain significant differences in the water price between sectors and areas (Just *et al* (1997)). The low water price in the agricultural, would be related to the food sufficiency, to strengthen the competitiveness of the sector or to maintain the population in the rural regions.

The main difficulty in obtaining a water price consists in the evaluation of the environmental and scarcity costs. The water economy tends to be based on the neo-classical economic theory and on the theories of environmental management.

In the economic theory, costs will increase with production until incomes decrease. We can take the decision of production depending on the value of marginal costs and incomes. The interception of demand and supply will define the market price. However, the water can not be produced as a good, following the concept of economic theory. We have to find a specific methodology to find the water price.

The price of water in agricultural sector can be estimated from a demand function and from the total cost of the resource. The total cost may include the investment and operating costs of the irrigation structures and also the environmental constraint (Fragoso, 2001).

The economic analysis of the use of the water in the irrigated has the objective of developing a prospective evaluation of the different options of economic, agricultural and environmental policies. These policies must be efficient and known by the producers. The knowledge of the marginal cost of small amounts of water is very useful. It means the trade off among the alternative uses and generations (present and future).

The main objective of this study is to evaluate the effects of alternative policies of water price for agriculture use in the farm income and the production pattern, having in account the recovery of the public investment and the operating costs with irrigation structures. It was applied to Odivelas Irrigation System, in Alentejo, South of Portugal.

This evaluation is done in terms of the use of water, of the allocation of the irrigated areas and of the agricultural returns, as also the recuperation of the water costs. Two alternative water pricing policies were considered. One is based on the water demand derived at the farm level. The other is based on the average cost of water, which includes the investment and operational costs of the irrigation infrastructures per unit volume.

This work is of the first ones done in Portugal that analyses the problem of the water management for the agricultural use, considering simultaneously the answer of the farmers to changing the water pricing and the recovery of the public investments with irrigation structures.

2. The Methodology

The United States has been adopting tariff systems in the irrigated areas since some years ago. With the tariff systems, it has been possible to motivate producers into saving water and raising the efficiency of its use. The tariff system by progressive landings, recommended by USDA Bureau of Reclamation, has been analyzed by several authors (Wichelns (1991); Brill *et al* (1997); Michelsen *et al* (1998)). Brill *et al* (1997) compare different options to reduce the use of the water in the irrigated areas, namely the implementation of tariffs by landings, of tariffs according to the average cost, and the possibility of transferring water rights among users.

Michelsen *et al* (1998) have used an econometric model to analyse the farmers' mood for the adoption of tariffs systems of water to motivate its saving. According those authors, the tariff systems allowing promotion of the sustainable use of the water would be more easily adopted in the irrigated areas having high water cost or where the production options are based on crops with high value added. In the irrigated areas with high availability of water or with crops of low value added, the adoption of those tariff systems is questionable.

Montginoul *et al* (1996) have also analyzed the farmers' mood in some irrigated areas in France for adopting alternative models of service management. In their study, the authors considered two management models: the introduction of limits on water allocated and a tariff system or both. These systems of management of the water have been used in France. The preference between one or another system, depends mainly on the availability conditions of the water resources, as well as the demand characteristics. These authors conclude that the use of tariff systems varies strongly with the demand elasticity of the water price and with the share of the quantity tariff in the total payment for irrigation water. The demand for water seems to be sensitive to the price for some crops, as is the case of cereals, oleaginous and proteaginous, where the cost of the water represents an important part of their production costs. In the case of the crops with a higher value added, the water demand is rather sensitive to the price, being the water availability limitation the most important instrument to obtain a sustainable water saving.

Sumpsi *et al* (1996) evaluated the effects of volumetric tariff systems, landings systems and a mixture of both in the Spanish irrigated areas. Those authors concluded that the demand function of water was very inelastic. As a consequence, the use of the tariff systems in order to save water is only effective at high levels of water price, resulting in a loss to the farmers' incomes.

Concerning agricultural use it is not really granted that the rise in the price of the water gives an incentive for its saving. In fact, the use of water can even increase if the elasticity of the irrigation efficiency is more relevant than the price-demand elasticity (Huffaker *et al* (1995)).

According to the objectives of this study, the proposed methodology will analyse the behaviour of the water demand following different values for the irrigation price and will analyse the cost of the water offer.

2.1. The Mathematical Programming Model

To represent the farmers' behaviour when confronted by different values of water price in irrigated areas, a mathematical programming model was developed adapted to the structural features of a farmer in the irrigated area of Odivelas, in the Alentejo. The discreet stochastic programming method suggested by Cocks (1968) and developed later by Rae (1971), is well adapted to the analysis of the agricultural production where the process of taking decisions is one of sequential type. Any decision about sowing, irrigation or harvesting, have to be taken considering that they depend upon each other and they are taken in a sequential way, being reviewed as time goes.

The model used is a sequential discreet stochastic programming one, based on the studies developed by Fragoso (1996; 2001), Jacquet *et al* (1997), Keplinger *et al* (1998) and Blanco (1999). This model maximises the expected farm income accounting the expectation of the occurrence of different conditions of the water use and the restrictions of the available resources (land, capital and labour). As the conditions of use of the water change (the water supplied), the producer can review his decisions changing the pattern of production, the production techniques, the amount of water to use and the amount of operating capital. The mathematical formulation of the model can be expressed as:

$$\text{Max } E(Z) = \sum_s p_s Z_s \quad (1)$$

$$\text{s.a.} \quad \sum_j \sum_a \sum_r \sum_t X_{j,a,r,t,s} \leq S \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_j \sum_a \sum_{rm} \sum_t X_{j,a,rm,t,s} \leq SI \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_j \sum_a \sum_r \sum_t q_{j,rm,t} X_{j,a,rm,t,s} \leq q_s, \quad \text{being } q_s \leq d_s \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_j \sum_a \sum_r \sum_t NM_{j,r,t,ic,m} X_{j,a,r,t,s} \leq DM_{ic,m} + AM_{ic,m,s} \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_j \sum_a \sum_t X_{j,a,r,t,s} \leq DEQ_{rm} + IEQ_{rm} \quad (6)$$

where: Z_s is the annual farm income in the natural state of water availability s (€); $X_{j,a,r,t,s}$ is the surface area of the crop j , according to the received subsidies a , the water regime or irrigation method r and the production technology t , in the state s (ha); q_s is the total use of water in the natural state s (m³); $AM_{ic,m,s}$ is the contracting of seasonal labour services and agricultural machinery ic , in the period m of the calendar and in the natural state s (h); IEQ_{rm} is the investment in irrigation equipment of type rm (ha); p_s is the probability of the occurrence of the natural state s ; S is the total surface area of the farm (ha); SI is the surface area benefiting by irrigation in the farm (ha); $q_{j,rm,t}$ is the gross annual irrigation requirements for crops j (m³/ha); d_s is the gross average water availability in the natural state s (m³); $NM_{j,r,t,ic,m}$ are the labour and agricultural machinery ic requirements for the activity j during the period m of the calendar (h/ha); $DM_{ic,m}$ is the availability of labour and machinery ic

during the period m of the calendar (h); DEQ_{rm} is the already installed capacity of irrigation equipment rm (ha);

The equation (1) represents the objective function which expresses the maximisation of the expected farm income. The expected farm income results from the incomes obtained in each natural state (s) taking into account the respective probability of occurrence. The income is obtained from the difference between the revenue (sales and subsidies) and the production costs. The farm income can be interpreted as the economic return obtained to the land and farmer's management.

The equations (2) and (3) represent the use of the total land and the use of the irrigated land, respectively.

The equation (4) concerns the conditions of the use of the water. On the right side we have the endowment of water supplied annually to the farmers in each natural state (s) and on the left side it is the total irrigation requirements for crops according to the irrigation system (non-irrigated, central pivot laterals, traveller guns, set sprinklers and drip irrigation) and to the production technique (more or less intensive). To represent the farmers' expectations in what concern the annual water endowment, were established three natural states (s): great availability of water, medium availability and small availability. These states were estimated through the distribution probability function of water use in the area of Odivelas along the years.

The equation (5) is concerned with the use of the labour and the agricultural machinery; the equation (6) represents the investment in equipment by irrigation type of system (central pivot laterals, traveller guns, set sprinklers and drip irrigation).

The model also includes equations respecting the financing of short term and other long term investments, the access of the producer to the banking credit and the restrictions imposed by the Common Agricultural Policy as regards to the set-aside land.

The model allows simulation of the farmer's strategies following the application of water tariffs, namely in determining the effects on the use of water, on the farmer's income, on the pattern crops, as well as the recovery of the public investments. Considering the increase of their water costs, the farmer can adjust his activity through:

- a) change of crop areas;
- b) change the use of the factors, reducing or increasing the operating capital;
- c) substitution between irrigated crops and non-irrigated ones;
- d) change in the irrigation techniques;
- e) improvement of the irrigation infrastructures in the farm.

2.2. The Average Cost of the Water

The Portuguese law classifies the public irrigation projects in four groups considering the social and economic impacts at national, regional, local and private levels. In projects with national and regional impact, the Government has assumed its construction and financing. The law foresees that the farmers would pay part of the total costs of that, which includes the investment and operating costs with the infrastructures.

The methodology used to calculate the average cost of the water follows the same philosophy of the Portuguese law to the public irrigated projects. In other words, for the average cost of the water, we considered the total costs of the initial investment, complementary benefiting infrastructures and the management costs, including the costs with the water users association.

The average cost of the water doesn't include the opportunity costs and great part of the environmental costs. They aren't included by limitations of the methodology and by lack of available information. It is the case of no information about the costs originated by the contamination, as well as the erosion of the soils and on the biodiversity due to the irrigation water impacts. The environmental costs considered are just those that are included in the maintenance services of the hydraulic infrastructures to guarantee the water quality and to avoid losses and wastes.

The calculation of the average cost of the water in the irrigated area of Odivelas in Alentejo, by the supply side, can be obtained by the following expression:

$$AC = [(\sum_i IC_i \times CF_i) / VU + \sum_i (CC_i \times CF_i) / \sum_i i] / AB \times AVQ_n \quad (7)$$

where: AC is the annual average water cost in €m^3 ; IC_i , and CC_i are, respectively, the investment and operating costs in i year; CF_i is the capitalization factor (near tax rate); VU is the useful life of the infrastructures; AB is area (ha) of the benefited area; and AVQ is the annual average quantity of water demanded by the farmers.

3. Results


In a first phase, we proceeded to the model validation, comparing the results obtained with the farmer's behaviour observed (annex 1). The model results were obtained for the short and the long term situations. Those allowed to conclude that the model represent in a general way the farmers' decisions and can be used as an instrument of prospective simulation. In a last phase, the model was used to estimate the water demand, considering the prices and the agricultural predictable subsidies in 2006, according to the main principles of the Common Agricultural Policy Reform of 2000.

Besides the water demand, the results of the model allow us to know the effects of the water price in the production and in the farmer's income. On the supply side, the water price allows us to estimate how much would have the farmers to pay in order for the government and the society to recuperate the costs with the irrigated land infrastructures.

3.1. The Water Demand Evaluation

In Figure 1 the expected results of the water demand are presented. The demand of water is shown as the water use by hectare of potential irrigated area.


The water use by hectare, when the water price is zero is about 5900 m^3 . That consumption does not change significantly for low water price ($0,02 \text{ €m}^3$). Higher prices lead to a progressive decrease of the water use, some stabilization being seen around 2300 and $795 \text{ m}^3/\text{ha}$ in the price gap between $0,11-0,24 \text{ €m}^3$ and $0,28-0,47 \text{ €m}^3$, respectively. Those gaps, such as the gap of $0-0,02 \text{ €m}^3$ correspond to the inelastic segments of the water demand function.



Source: Model Results

Figure 1. Irrigation water demand curve


Figures 2 and 3 present the effects of the water price policies in the irrigated area and in its use.



Source: Model Results

Figure 2. Irrigated land

Taking a water price up to $0,07 \text{ €/m}^3$, all the irrigated area of the farm is cultivated, representing about 35% of total available agricultural land (495 hectares). When we consider $0,24 \text{ €/m}^3$ for the water price, we can see that 20% of total area is irrigated land, representing 57% of potential irrigated area. However, if the price rises until $0,45 \text{ €/m}^3$, the irrigated area will decrease to 10% of total area and 29% of potential irrigated area. Considering a higher price up to $0,6 \text{ €/m}^3$, the producer completely abandons the irrigated crops.



Source: Model Results


Figure 3. Pattern Irrigated Crops

Considering the water price until $0,03 \text{ €/m}^3$, the maize crop land represents 18% of the farm and 50% of the irrigated area, being the main irrigated crop up to a water price of $0,07 \text{ €/m}^3$. The high profitability of the potato and the possibility of using sprinkler irrigation, allows it to constitute, in a certain way, an alternative to corn production for higher levels of water price (above $0,05 \text{ €/m}^3$). Beet production represents only 4% of the total area and does not react to the increase of the water price, since its area remains the same until the water price is $0,27 \text{ €/m}^3$. The onion reveals a profitable irrigated crop for water price lower than $0,1 \text{ €/m}^3$. The tomato area increases for 8% of the total area when the water price rise to $0,1 \text{ €/m}^3$. This surface level remains until the water price is $0,24 \text{ €/m}^3$. For higher water price the tomato area decreases quickly.

When the water price is zero, the farm income is 300 €/ha and becomes negative when the water price is higher than $0,3 \text{ €/m}^3$. Above this price level, the irrigated land is no longer profitable since it does not generate enough income to pay all factors, although it is possible to cover the operating costs until the water price reaches $0,6 \text{ €/m}^3$ (Figure 4).


As expected, the greatest income losses occur when the water demand is inelastic, that is, in the price gaps $0-0,02 \text{ €/m}^3$ and $0,11-0,24 \text{ €/m}^3$. In the first case, the income decreases from 300 to 265 €/ha and in the second one, from 134 to 29 €/ha , representing a loss of 12% and 78%, respectively. In the elastic sections of the water demand curve, the producers try to reduce the income losses, replacing crops more demanding of water by others less demanding or simply reducing the area of irrigation that is substituted by non-irrigated or fallow ground crops.

In the Figure 5, the recuperation of water costs by hectare of potential irrigated area is presented, corresponding, in fact, to the expenses that the farmers have with irrigation water. Those would must to recovery of the public investment and the management costs of the irrigation infrastructures.



Source: Model Results

Figure 4. Farm Income



Source: Model Results

Figure 5. Recuperation of Water Cost

In the farm under study, the recuperation of water cost reach 300 €m^3 in a first phase, when the water price is 0,07 €m^3 .

In the gap price of 0,08-0,13 €m^3 it happens a reduction of the recuperation of water cost, leading to a strong reduction of the water use. From that price landing, the recuperation of water cost increases successively up to 545 €ha , when the water price is 0,26 €m^3 . From that price level on, the recuperation of water costs decrease successively and in abrupt way.

The greater increase of the recuperation of water cost is seen when the price gaps are 0-0,02 €m^3 and 0,11-0,24 €m^3 . In those price gaps, where the water demand is very inelastic, neither the water use nor the irrigation area decreases.

3.2. The Supply water price evaluation

The main infrastructures of the irrigated area of Odivelas are the dams of Odivelas and Alvito, and the primary and secondary watering networks of Odivelas.

The whole investment costs were estimated in 98,6 million euros, corresponding to an annual cost of 1,97 million euros. We have to add half a million euros for the operating costs. Considering the supply side, for the whole 6381 hectare of irrigated land, an annual average cost of 384,82 €/ha was calculated, which in the demand side corresponds to a price of 0,17 €/m³ (see Annex).

The calculated price of the water is in the second inelastic segment of the demand curve (0,11-0,24€/m³). At this price, the use of water corresponds to 2300 m³/ha, representing to an irrigated area of 20% and about 50% of potential irrigated area. The production planning would be made up by potato, beet and onion and non-irrigated crops. The farm income should decrease to 85 €/ha, that is, 70% from the income obtained when the water price is 0-0,02 €/m³.

4. Conclusion

This study analysis the water price policies in an irrigated farm in the Alentejo Region of Portugal, according to the economic theory of demand and supply. The study of the demand was based on the prevision of the farmer's behaviour. For this purposed, a mathematical programming model adapted to the structural characteristics of the farm studied was developed, taking into account the main economical and institutional features. We used a discrete stochastic programming model that allows adjustment to a production planning according to the farmer's expectation, in that which concerns the water availability. On the supply side the water cost was estimated through its average cost, without considering the scarcity and the environmental costs.

The results allow us to conclude that the water demand is very inelastic when the water prices are relatively reduced, up to 0,02 €/m³. At this price level there is no decrease either of the water use or of the irrigated area and crops replacement is not made. The corn is clearly the main irrigated land crop. The income is very sensitive to the raising in the water price. However, its reduction does not exceed 12%, when compared with a zero water price. When the price 0,02 €/m³ is exceeded, the demand becomes less inelastic, and noticeable reductions in the use of water and in the irrigated area can be seen. Its effects on the income are partly softened by the strategy of the farmers to adapt themselves to less water demanding crops, such as the case of the potato and of the beet.

The annual average cost of the water was estimated in 384,82 €/m³, corresponding to a demand price of the water of 0,17 €/m³. At this level, the price at the supply side is placed in a very inelastic demand segment and the effects would be strongly negative in what concerns the use of irrigated area as well as the agricultural incomes.

REFERENCES

M. Blanco, (1999), *La Economía del Agua: Análisis de Políticas de Modernización y Mejora de Regadíos en España*. Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Tesis doctoral, Madrid.

C. Noeme and R. Fragoso. "Evaluation of Alternative Policies of Irrigation Water Price. Application to Large Farms in Alentejo Region". *Agricultural Engineering International: the CIGR Journal of Scientific Research and Development*. Manuscript LW 04 006. Vol. VI. December, 2004.

- E. Brill, E. Hochman, et D. Zilberman, (1997), *Allocation and Pricing at the Water District Level*, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 79 (3), pp. 952-963.
- K. Cocks, (1968), *Discrete stochastic programming*, *Management Science*, 15, pp. 72-79.
- E. Daehnhardt, (1998), *Perímetros de Rega em Exploração: Algumas Características e Elementos Estatísticos até ao ano de 1996*. Direcção de Serviços de Hidráulica Agrícola, Instituto de Estruturas Agrárias e Desenvolvimento Rural, Ministério da Agricultura Pescas e Alimentação. Lisboa.
- Directive 2000/60/EC, (2000), *Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 Establishing a Framework for Community Action in the Field of Water Policy*. Official Journal of European Communities 22.12.2000, L 327 pp. 1-72.
- R. Fragoso, (1996), *Évaluation des impacts socio-économiques du développement de l'irrigation: le cas de l'agriculture dans la région de l'Alentejo*. CIHEAM-IAMM, Collection de Thèses et Masters IAMM, n.º 40, Montpellier.
- R. Fragoso, (2001), *Avaliação dos Impactos Sócio-Económicos de Plano de Rega de Alqueva no Sector Agrícola do Alentejo: o caso do bloco de rega da infra-estrutura 12*, Universidade de Évora, Dissertação de Doutoramento, Évora.
- P. Hazell, et R. Norton, (1986), *Mathematical Programming for Economic Analysis in Agriculture*. Mac Millan Publishing Company, New York.
- R. Huffaker et N. Whittlesey, (1991), *Agricultural water conservation legislation. Will it save water? Choices, fourth quarter*, pp. 24-28.
- F. Jacquet, et J. Pluvinage, (1997), *Climatic Uncertainty and Farm Policy: A Discrete Stochastic Programming Model for Cereal-Livestock Farms in Algeria*, *Agricultural Systems*, 53, pp. 387-407.
- R. Just, S. Netanyahu, et J. Horowitz, (1997), *The Political Economy of Domestic Water Allocation: The Cases of Israel and Jordan*, D.D. Parker et Y. Tsur (eds.), *Decentralization and coordination of water resource management*, pp. 89-114. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, USA.
- K. Keplinger, B. Mccarl, M. Chowdhury, et R. Lacewell, (1998), *Economic and Hydrologic Implications of Suspending Irrigation in Dry Years*, *Journal Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 23, pp. 191-205.
- M. Michelsen, J. Mcguckin, R. Taylor, et R. Huffaker, (1998), *Irrigation District Adoption of Water Conserving Rate Structures*, In: *American Agricultural Economics Association, 1998 Annual Meeting «Responsible Resource Use in a Global Economy»*, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA, 2-5 August 1998.
- M. Montginoul; et T. Rieu, (1996), *Instruments Économiques et Gestion de l'Eau d'Irrigation en France*, *La Houille Blanche*, 8, pp. 47-54.
- L. Ohlsson, (ed) (1995), *Hydropolitics-Conflicts over water as a development constraint*. Zed Books & University Press, Londres/Nueva York & Dhaka.
- A. Rae, (1971), *An empirical application and evaluation of discrete stochastic programming in farm management*. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 53, pp. 625-638.

J. Sumpsi; A. Garrido; M. Blanco, C. Varela; E. Iglesias, et L. Avellá, (1996), *Estudio sobre a economía del agua y la competitividad de los regadíos españoles*. Secretaría General Técnica de Desarrollo Rural y Conservación de Naturaleza, MAPA, Madrid.

D. Wilchens, (1991), *Motivation reductions in drain water with block rate prices for irrigation water*. *Water Resources Bull.* 27, 585-592.

ANNEXES

	Farmers' behaviour	Model results in the	Model results in the
	observed	short term	long term
Irrigated land	173	174.00	174.00
Durum wheat	70	13.11	12.72
Corn	56	134.07	126.27
Sunflower	47	26.22	7.80
Beets	-	-	7.59
Potato	-	-	0.78
Onion	-	-	8.10
Lettuce	-	-	0.54
Tomato	-	-	10.20
Dry land	322	321.00	321.00
Durum wheat	116	120.22	105.00
Sunflower	64	61.12	81.10
Set-aside	37	37.55	35.40
Follow	105	102.12	99.11

Fonte: Model results

Annex1. Farmers' behaviour observed and model results (ha)

Total equipped irrigation area (ha)	6381
Annual average available water (m ³ /ha)	8340
Annual average consumption (m ³ /ha)	2300
Useful life (years)	50
Investment costs (€)	98.554.500
Annual investment costs (€)	1.971.090
Operating costs (€)	484.500
Annual costs / ha of equipped irrigation area (€/ha)	384.82
Middle water cost (€/m ³)	0.17

Source: Fonte: Daehnhart, 1999; and Watering Farmers Association;

Annex 2. Average of water cost in Odivelas irrigation

C. Noeme and R. Fragoso. "Evaluation of Alternative Policies of Irrigation Water Price. Application to Large Farms in Alentejo Region". *Agricultural Engineering International: the CIGR Journal of Scientific Research and Development*. Manuscript LW 04 006. Vol. VI. December, 2004.