

AGRICULTURAL DRAINAGE DEVELOPMENT: A
SIMULATION APPROACH FOR PUBLIC
EXPENDITURE DECISIONS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of Graduate Studies

University of Manitoba

In Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Ranjit H. Singh

October 1978st



AGRICULTURAL DRAINAGE DEVELOPMENT: A
SIMULATION APPROACH FOR PUBLIC
EXPENDITURE DECISIONS

BY

RANJIT H. SINGH

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

© 1978

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this dissertation, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
dissertation and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this dissertation.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ABSTRACT

In this thesis an attempt was made to develop an analytical framework which could be employed as a management tool to assist in public expenditure decisions on agricultural drainage development. A simulation model was constructed. It evaluates the impact of alternative levels of drainage improvement in terms of the benefits generated, the net benefits, costs and benefit/cost ratios.

Because agricultural production in many parts of Manitoba is adversely affected by excess moisture remaining on the land, drainage improvement works are often considered for alleviating the problem. Provision of improved drainage can reduce the duration of excess moisture to which crops are exposed. This will, in turn, result in crop damage avoided. While crop damage reduction is the major benefit from investments in more efficient and more effective drainage there are other benefits. These include the reduced risk of crop losses, the multiplier effect from an increase in expenditures resulting from higher incomes and other unmeasurable social benefits.

Because of the large expenditures associated with drainage development there is a growing demand made by the public sector for such development projects to be economically justified. Not only should drainage be shown to be feasible but also drainage design optimum (or optimum capacities) must be identified.

A deterministic version of the simulation model was used to evaluate the feasibility of drainage improvements in the Big Grass Watershed in Manitoba. The results indicate that drainage improvement

works are feasible for only parts of this watershed, totalling 108 square miles or about 25 percent of the area. At the optimum levels of drainage development the total discounted benefits is \$2.7 million. Cost of drain construction and maintenance is \$2.0 million. Thus, net benefits are \$0.7 million and the benefit/cost ratio for the watershed is 1.35

A stochastic simulation model was also constructed. It was used to investigate the impact of random disturbance in storm magnitude, crop prices and production costs on the output variables which are useful for decision-making - that is, benefits, net benefits, optimum channel capacity and benefit/cost ratio. The exogenous variables listed above were expected to exert the strongest influence on the dispersion of the output variables. The stochastic version of the model was applied to subwatershed 2.01.02. The statistical distributions of the output variables were estimated from a sample of 30 simulation runs. The 95 percent confidence interval estimated for various decision variables were as follows:

- | | | |
|-------|---|----------------------------|
| (i) | Benefits: | \$79,000 - \$95,000 |
| (ii) | Net Benefits: | \$54,000 - \$68,000 |
| (iii) | Optimum Drain Capacity (at the outlet): | 99.5 c.f.s. - 105.5 c.f.s. |
| (iv) | Benefit/Cost ratio: | 3.06 - 3.56 |

The results indicate a relatively stable optimum drain design since 95 percent of all optima estimated for subwatershed 2.01.02 are expected to fall within a range of six c.f.s.

The implication is that drainage design works on the basis of information on optimum capacities which are derived from the deterministic model are expected to closely approximate the true optimum. Net benefits are also narrowly dispersed about the mean. The range for the 95 percent confidence interval being only \$14,000.

Given the statistical distributions of the decision variables the probable error associated with any decision taken on the basis of information obtained from the deterministic model can be estimated. Thus with the knowledge of these distributions the deterministic model constitutes an adequate model for providing information on drainage expenditure decisions.

Because changes in storm levels, crop prices and production costs are likely to cause similar movements in benefits (though not in absolute magnitude) in various subwatersheds under conditions of improved drainage it is expected that the behaviour of decision variables for these subwatersheds will tend to possess statistical distributions with similar properties to those shown for subwatershed 2.01.02. Under this assumption the information generated by the stochastic simulation analysis can be made generally applicable to other subwatersheds.

This study also showed that for the watershed evaluated land use adjustments were necessary to facilitate efficient resource use. Optimum drainage development was associated with increases in the acreages of field crops and tame hay by 50 and 34 percent, respectively. Native grassland acreage was reduced by 35 percent and bushes decreased by 54 percent.

The analytical model developed has been shown to be adequate for evaluating agricultural drainage development. It can readily be applied to other areas where similar problems in agricultural production are experienced.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research problem chosen for this dissertation reflects my interest in the subject matter and the observation that there was a need to develop an analytical framework of the type presented in this study for evaluating drainage expenditures. This thesis relied heavily on the concepts and relationships which were developed by Dr. L. Rigaux when he served as project director on two previous studies dealing with the economics of drainage. I am, indeed, indebted to him for this and also for the valuable experience gained from him while working as a research fellow on these studies. Also, as my major advisor, Dr. L. Rigaux was extremely helpful, providing assistance on general academic matters, encouragement during the program of study and stimulation in the area of research. Because of the foregoing and also because he was always accessible for consultation, I have found my graduate program most enjoyable and rewarding. I cannot thank him sufficiently.

The Water Resources Division, Manitoba Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management, has shown strong interest in the development of an analytical technique for evaluating the economic feasibility of drainage expenditures. I wish to express my thanks to the Division for the permission to use the data for the Big Grass Watershed and also for general assistance with the study. In particular, I wish to thank Mr. S. Block, P.Eng., head of the Design

Section. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the study it was difficult at times to bridge the gaps between disciplines—particularly engineering and economics. I have benefitted tremendously from the knowledge and experience of Mr. S. Block and was thus better able to develop the underlying concepts of the study. I wish to express my gratitude for this and also for his encouragement and assistance in his role as a member of the Advisory Committee throughout the entire study.

Many other individuals at the Water Resources Division were helpful and in particular I wish to thank E. Sapinski and H. Roopra who did the drainage design and cost estimates, L. Slevinsky and C. Jenkins who provided assistance in the area of agronomy and T. Wallis and H. Sagar who helped with the programming of the model.

I wish to thank Professor T. S. Major who, as a member of my advisory committee, provided rather useful comments on the thesis generally and in particular on the analytical technique. I also wish to express my thanks to other members of the committee—Dr. D. Kraft and the external examiner, Dr. W. Phillips.

I am indeed grateful to Mrs. I. Chomiak, Mrs. C. Remedios and Miss D. Duhamel for typing the manuscript.

The pursuit of this level of academic training was not without considerable encouragement and inspiration from my parents in earlier years. My sincere thanks to them. Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to my wife, Laureen, who was understanding and helpful throughout the academic program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi
LIST OF MAPS	xix
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION: THE PROBLEM OF EXCESS MOISTURE	1
OBJECTIVES	4
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BIG GRASS WATERSHED	6
Area for Drainage Improvement	6
Physical Features	6
Present Land Use	11
Agricultural Capability	12
Wildlife Capability	14
Crop Yields	15
THESIS OUTLINE	16
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	17
INTRODUCTION	17
BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS	18
SIMULATION STUDIES	22
ECONOMICS OF AGRICULTURAL DRAINAGE	23

Chapter	Page
PHYSICAL EFFECTS OF EXCESS MOISTURE ON PLANTS . . .	28
SUMMARY	32
3 DEVELOPMENT OF A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	35
INTRODUCTION	35
EXCESS MOISTURE	35
EXCESS MOISTURE AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY	40
ALLEVIATING THE PROBLEM: DRAINAGE TECHNOLOGY	41
ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF WATERSHED DRAINAGE DEVELOPMENT	42
BENEFITS	43
COSTS	46
4 THE UNDERLYING THEORETICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF DRAINAGE	47
OVERVIEW	47
WELFARE THEORY AND ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY	49
THE GNP CRITERION FOR WELFARE IMPROVEMENT	54
MICRO-ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENTS TO DRAINAGE DEVELOPMENT	57
SUMMARY	65
5 CONSTRUCTION OF THE THEORETICAL MODEL	67
INTRODUCTION	67
BENEFITS	67
COSTS	73
MARKET PRICES: THE EVALUATION OF BENEFITS AND COSTS	73
DISCOUNT RATE	75

Chapter	Page
PROJECT LIFE	77
SOCIAL OPTIMUM	78
6 ANALYTICAL MODEL	81
INTRODUCTION	81
General Characteristics of Computer Simulation Models	83
SURVEY OF THE LOGIC OF THE MODEL	88
THE DETERMINISTIC AND STOCHASTIC MODELS COMPARED	95
THE DETERMINISTIC SIMULATION MODEL	97
Stage One: Storm Precipitation and Storm Runoff Components	97
General Watershed Data	109
Stage Two: Subwatershed Analysis	111
Moisture excess component	112
Productivity relationship component	120
Economic returns component	124
Economic benefit component	132
Economic cost component	133
Economic feasibility component	139
Stage Three: Optimum Watershed Development . .	141
7 THE STOCHASTIC SIMULATION MODEL	149
AN OVERVIEW OF THE MODEL	149
THE STORM SIMULATION COMPONENT	153
THE ECONOMIC SIMULATION COMPONENT	163
STORM RUNOFF COMPONENT	167

Chapter	Page
MOISTURE EXCESS COMPONENT	169
PRODUCTIVITY RELATIONSHIPS COMPONENT	171
ECONOMIC RETURNS COMPONENT	171
ECONOMIC BENEFITS COMPONENT	172
ECONOMIC COST COMPONENT	173
STATISTICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SYSTEM'S OUTPUT	174
8 DRAINAGE DESIGN AND COSTS	175
INTRODUCTION	175
Design of On-Farm Drains	176
Design of Lateral and Main Drains	181
Right-of-Way Costs	185
Design of Structures	186
Drainage Design Levels	188
Drainage Construction Costs	192
Maintenance Cost	193
9 PREPARATION OF DATA FOR THE ANALYTICAL MODEL	195
INTRODUCTION	195
Soil and Land Use Data	195
Soil Texture	196
Hydrologic Soil Groups	197
Soil Capability	200
Soil Productivity Groups	200
Land Use	201

Chapter	Page
HYDROLOGIC DATA	203
PRECIPITATION DATA	208
Estimating Watershed Precipitation	208
Normality of Precipitation Data (1961-75) for Project Analysis	211
Runoff Curve Numbers	212
AGRONOMY DATA	218
Land Use Alternatives	218
Land Use Restraints	220
Crop Yield Data	222
ECONOMIC DATA	223
Agricultural Prices and Production Costs	223
Land Development Costs	224
INTERNALLY GENERATED STORM DATA	226
Generating Storm Data	226
Storm Event Patterns	229
CROP DAMAGE COEFFICIENTS	230
INTERNAL GENERATION OF ECONOMIC DATA	234
10 THE FEASIBILITY OF DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS	238
INTRODUCTION	238
PRELIMINARY BENEFIT/COST ANALYSIS	239
OPTIMIZING THE LEVEL OF DRAINAGE DEVELOPMENT	246
Procedure for Optimizing Drainage	251
Group 1 Subwatersheds	253

Chapter	Page
Group 2 Subwatersheds	257
Group 3 Subwatersheds	260
Group 4 Subwatershed	263
Group 5 Subwatersheds	263
Group 6 Subwatershed	267
Group 7 Subwatersheds	269
Group 8 Subwatershed	272
Group 9 Subwatershed.	277
Group 10 Subwatershed	277
Group 11 Subwatershed.	282
Group 12 Subwatershed	282
Group 13 Subwatersheds	282
EVALUATION OF DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS . .	287
Adequacy of the Angle Drain and Grass River . . .	290
Adequacy of Main Channels Flowing into Angle Drain or Grass River	292
OPTIMUM WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT PLAN	297
Levels of Development	300
Channel Diversions	303
Land Use Change	304
Wildlife Uses	309
Summary of the Optimum Watershed Development Plan	310
SENSITIVITY OF DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT FEASIBILITY TO CROP PRICES	312

Chapter	Page
11 STOCHASTIC SIMULATION OF BENEFITS FROM DRAINAGE DEVELOPMENT	316
12 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	324
BIBLIOGRAPHY	329
APPENDIX A	336
APPENDIX B	354
APPENDIX C	361
APPENDIX D	374
APPENDIX E	390
APPENDIX F	392
APPENDIX G	399

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1.1 Soils in the Big Grass Watershed	9
1.2 Present Land Use in the Big Grass Watershed	12
1.3 Agricultural Soil Capability in the Big Grass Watershed	14
1.4 Average Yields in the Big Grass Watershed	15
6.1 List of Variables	145
8.1 Unit Construction Costs for On-Farm Drains	181
8.2 Construction Cost for Crossing Structures	189
8.3 Cost of Gradient Control Structures	189
8.4 Design Discharge Equations for the Level 4 Protection	190
8.5 Annual Maintenance Costs	194
9.1 Average Yields for Crops and Forage in the Big Grass Watershed	199
9.2 Characteristics of the Soils in the Big Grass Watershed	202
9.3 Hydrologic Data	204
9.4 Runoff Curve Numbers (AMC II) for Hydrologic Soil-Cover Complexes	215
9.5 Runoff Curve Numbers for AMC I and AMC III	216
9.6 Land Use Alternatives	219
9.7 Allocation of Cropland Acreages	221
9.8 Agricultural Prices and Production Costs	224

Table	Page
9.9 Land Development Costs	225
9.10 Marginal Crop Damage Coefficients for Estimating the Improved Productivity from PE Reduction . . .	233
9.11 Mean and Standard Deviations for Deflated Agricultural Prices (1950-76)	235
10.1 Preliminary Benefit-Cost Analysis Results for the Big Grass Watershed: Summary of Findings	241
10.2 Subwatershed Grouping for Drainage Optimization . .	250
10.3 Benefit-Cost Results for Group 1 Subwatersheds at the Optimum	254
10.4 Benefit-Cost Results for Group 2 Subwatersheds at the Optimum	259
10.5 Benefit-Cost Results for Group 3 Subwatersheds at the Optimum	261
10.6 Benefit-Cost Results for Group 4 Subwatershed at the Optimum	265
10.7 Benefit-Cost Results for Group 5 Subwatersheds at the Optimum	266
10.8 Benefit-Cost Results for Group 6 Subwatersheds at the Optimum	271
10.9 Benefit-Cost Results for Group 7 Subwatersheds at the Optimum	274
10.10 Benefit-Cost Results for Group 8 Subwatershed at the Optimum	276
10.11 Benefit-Cost Results for Group 9 Subwatershed at the Optimum	279
10.12 Benefit-Cost Results for Group 10 Subwatershed at the Optimum	281
10.13 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 11 Subwatershed at the Optimum	284

Table	Page
10.14 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 12 Subwatershed at the Optimum	286
10.15 Benefit-Cost Results for Group 13 Subwatersheds at the Optimum	289
10.16 Existing and Required Drain Designs for the Angle Drain and Grass River	292
10.17 Downstream Effects from Optimum Development of Group 6 Subwatersheds	294
10.18 Downstream Effects from Optimum Development of Group 7 Subwatersheds	298
10.19 Downstream Effects from Optimum Development of Group 8 Subwatershed	299
10.20 Summary of Optimum Benefit-Cost Results for Groups of Subwatersheds which are Feasible for Drainage Improvement Works	301
10.21 Land Use Modifications Associated with Optimum Drainage Development in the Big Grass Watershed .	305
10.22 Benefit-Cost Analysis Results for Optimum Drainage Development of the Big Grass Watershed	311
10.23 Sensitivity of Drainage Improvement Feasibility for Selected Subwatersheds to Crop Prices	313
11.1 Stochastic Simulation Benefit-Cost Analysis Results for Subwatershed 2.01.02	318
11.2 Statistical Results for Decision Variables Derived from Stochastic Simulation Analysis for Subwatershed 2.01.02	320

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
4.1	Indifference Curves and the Budget Constraints . .	51
4.2	Maximum Social Welfare	53
4.3	Maximizing GNP	55
4.4	Shift in the Production Possibility Frontier from Drainage Improvement	59
4.5	Production Conditions When Excess Moisture Problems are Frequent	61
4.6	Production Conditions When Excess Moisture Problems are Reduced	62
4.7	The Effect of Drainage Improvement on Factor Intensity	63
4.8	The Effect of Drainage Improvement on Output Combination	64
5.1	Increased Consumer's Surplus Induced by a Project's Output	69
5.2	Increased Producer's Surplus Induced by a Project's Output	70
5.3	Discount Rate in an Idealized System	77
5.4	Economic Optimum	79
6.1	Generalized Flow Diagram of the Analytical Model	89
6.2	The Deterministic Simulation Model	104
6.3	The Synthetic Inflow and Outflow Hydrographs . .	116
7.1	Stochastic-Dynamic Simulation Model	156
8.1	On-Farm Drain Template	177

Figure	Page
8.2 Main Channel Template	177
8.3 Spacing and Excavation of On-Farm Drains	179
8.4 Depth-Discharge Relationship and Cost per Lineal Mile of On-Farm Drain	180
8.5 Excavation and Structure Costs of Main Channels . .	183
8.6 Excavation and Structure Costs of Lateral Drains .	184
8.7 Right-of-Way Costs	187
10.1 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 1 Subwatersheds	256
10.2 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 2 Subwatersheds	258
10.3 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 3 Subwatersheds	262
10.4 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 4 Subwatershed	264
10.5 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 5 Subwatersheds	268
10.6 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 6 Subwatersheds	270
10.7 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 7 Subwatersheds	273
10.8 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 8 Subwatershed	275
10.9 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 9 Subwatershed	278
10.10 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 10 Subwatershed	280
10.11 Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 11 Subwatershed	283

Figure		Page
10.12	Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 12 Subwatershed	285
10.13	Benefit-Cost Relationships for Group 13 Subwatersheds	288
11.1	Cumulative Probabilities for Obtaining Various Levels of Benefits	323
11.2	Cumulative Probabilities for Obtaining Various Levels of Net Benefits	323

LIST OF MAPS

Map		Page
1.1	Location of the Big Grass Watershed	7
1.2	Contour Map of the Big Grass Watershed	8
1.3	Physiographic Regions in the Big Grass Watershed	10
6.1	Drainage Channels in the Big Grass Watershed	99
9.1	Isohyets Showing Average Growing Season Precipitation in the Big Grass Watershed	209
10.1	Subwatersheds Requiring No Drainage Improvements Because of Adequate Natural Drainage	242
10.2	Subwatersheds Which Showed B/C Ratios from 0.01 to 0.80	244
10.3	Subwatersheds With B/C Ratios from 0.81 to 0.99	245
10.4	Subwatersheds with B/C Ratios from 1.00 to 1.99	246
10.5	Subwatersheds with B/C Ratios from 2.00 to 2.75	248
10.6	Subwatershed Groups for Which Drainage Improvements are Proposed	252

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEM OF EXCESS MOISTURE

For many parts of agricultural Manitoba excess moisture is a major land resource limitation. One reason accounting for this fact is that important crops in the Province such as wheat, oats, barley and flax are quite sensitive to excess moisture exposure during the growing period. The importance of excess moisture as a resource limitation in Agro-Manitoba is evidenced by the fact that for many areas of the Province frequent crop losses are experienced because of the occurrence of excess moisture on the land. Concern about alleviating the problem arises because technical solutions, in the form of improved artificial drainage, are readily available and for many areas such solutions may be both economically and financially feasible.

The magnitude of the problem is reflected by depressed yields in certain areas, regional demands for better drainage as expressed by municipalities, government departments and farmers, by lower farm incomes (than potentially possible) in certain areas and by indemnity payments by the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation (MCIC) for crop losses from excess moisture.^{1, 2} A more general reflection of the extent of the excess

¹It has been shown that for an area in south-east Manitoba, the average annual crop loss per acre due to excess moisture ranged between \$13 and \$16 for insured crops. See: L.R. Rigaux and R.H. Singh (1973: 5).

²The Manitoba Crop Insurance Corp. indicated in 1975 that excess moisture was the major cause of crop loss in eight of the 15 risk areas in the Province. Source: (unpublished information).

moisture problem (spatially) in the Province is shown by the agricultural soil capability maps.³ Large areas have been classified as having a wetness limitation according to the Canada Land Inventory Classification.

Excess moisture on agricultural lands can introduce a number of adverse effects into farm production. Specifically, moisture conditions at seeding time may delay seeding, thus shortening the available growing period which generally tends to lower yields. These conditions may exist for an extended period thus leaving too short a growing period for cereal crop production. Periodic occurrence of excess moisture during the growing season tends to reduce both the plant population (number of stands) and the output per plant. During the mature stages the presence of excess moisture can cause losses in the quality of grain.

It should be noted that these adverse effects on plant productivity result primarily because excess water induces oxygen deficiency in the root environment (Williamson and Kriz, 1970: 216). This situation is referred to as an "oxygen stress".⁴

In addition to the foregoing, waterlogged soils are associated with efficiency costs with respect to agricultural production because of greater machine and labour time requirements, higher fuel consumption,

³Soil capability for agriculture are mapped by: Canada Land Inventory, Department of Regional Economic Expansion, Soil Capacity for Agriculture (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1966).

⁴An "Oxygen" stress is defined as an undesirable effect caused in the plant by an oxygen deficiency in the root zone of the plant. On the other hand "water stress" is defined as the adverse effect of water deficit on plant growth.

lack of production flexibility, reduced effectiveness of chemical inputs and uncertainty.

The problem of excess moisture is generally confined to areas of the Province where natural drainage is poor. The flatness of such areas preclude efficient drainage by the natural system.

Since a major purpose of drainage is to provide a root environment which results in optimum crop yields it is no surprise, therefore, to find that for a large percentage of the areas in the Province with agricultural moisture excess problems, a significant amount of artificial drainage exists.⁵ The continued existence of the problem (probably to lesser degrees) for areas already provided with artificial drainage seems to suggest that the current standard of drainage service may be inadequate. Improved service for agricultural land use may include both a more effective system and a more efficient system. Effectiveness refers to the extension of the drainage system from the main channel to the agricultural fields. This necessitates the provision of a complete system - that is the main channels, collection drains and on-farm drains. Efficiency refers to the ability of the system to remove the excess moisture in a relatively short time. In this sense a system with larger capacity is more efficient because it removes a given amount of water in a shorter period of time.

⁵Useful background information on agricultural drainage, drainage expenditures by municipality and total amounts of drain is presented in: The Manitoba Water Commission Reports: A Review of Agricultural Drainage in Manitoba.

Response by the public sector to the demands for improved drainage, expressed in various forms, involves allocative decisions with respect to large expenditures. While the economic benefits from public expenditure on drainage may be large, there still remains important decision - making questions to be answered. These include - the question of economic feasibility - do the benefits justify the costs; the question of what level of drainage protection will maximize economic benefits; and the question of how well drainage projects compare with alternate projects designed for the agricultural or other sectors.

This study is concerned with resource allocation by the public sector to improve the efficiency of agricultural production in the Big Grass Watershed. Therefore, it attempts to provide information to public sector decision-makers on the economic desirability of public expenditure for drainage development and on the system design which will maximize net economic benefits. The objectives of the study are presented next.

OBJECTIVES

The broad objectives of this study were firstly, to develop an analytical framework for the economic evaluation of drainage development for the purpose of land resource modifications and secondly, to apply this framework to Big Grass Watershed in Manitoba. The framework developed should provide the capability for evaluating areas typified by the Big Grass Watershed with diverse soil characteristics and variability in land use and hydraulic characteristics. Specific objectives were as follows:

1. To consolidate the available information for this Watershed on agronomic and economic factors affecting land use and to use this information to select the realistic agricultural land use possibilities in this Watershed.

2. To determine the present level of agricultural drainage protection for the various subwatersheds by compiling: (i) hydrologic data such as drainage capacities, slopes and drainage areas, and (ii) data on land use (cover) and soil textures.
3. To establish for analytical purposes alternative levels of improved drainage service in each subwatershed based on the existing level of service and agricultural capability of the land.
4. For the levels of service identified above to estimate the associated costs for drainage development.
5. For each level of drainage improvement included in the analysis to determine the highest economic use of the land resource from the subset of alternative land use identified for this watershed and economic constraints.
6. To estimate the benefits resulting from the improvement in the various levels of drainage service where the highest economic use is assumed.
7. To compare the benefits and costs over an assumed project life and to critically assess the completeness of such information (single-valued estimators and results) to determine the economic feasibility of investment in agricultural drainage improvement in the various subwatersheds and to anticipate what other information is desirable.
8. To investigate the factors which may inhibit the highest economic use and to add further elements that may exert influence on the benefit-cost analysis so far.
9. To investigate the stochastic characteristics of certain variables in the model and to incorporate these characteristics into the analysis to determine the confidence limits for the important output variables.