

Irrigation Scheduling for Young Pongamia (*Millettia pinnata* (L.) Panigrahi) Trees¹

Daniel Palacios-Linares, Sandra M. Guzmán, Amir Rezazadeh, Liliana M. Cano, Lorenzo Rossi, and Alan Wright²

Millettia pinnata

[View Assessment](#)

North, Central, South

Prohibited

Prohibited from use in Florida according to the Federal Noxious Weed List, the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) 5B-64.011 Prohibited Aquatic Plants, or FDACS 5B-57.007 Noxious Weed List.

Introduction

This publication examines the effects of irrigation scheduling on water use, plant growth, and development in young pongamia trees (*Millettia pinnata* (L.) Panigrahi). Young trees are defined as those below bearing age (three years and younger). The information provided is based on data collected during 2021–2022 in Florida flatwood soil. We compared three irrigation scheduling methods: soil moisture (SM)-based, evapotranspiration (ET)-based, and calendar (GR)-based. There are no irrigation guidelines for pongamia in Florida. Therefore, growers are currently following the calendar-based recommendations for young citrus trees. This document is intended for stakeholders involved in pongamia irrigation management, including pongamia growers, land managers, certified crop advisors, water management districts, and other parties interested in this topic.

An Overview of *Millettia pinnata* (L.) Panigrahi

Pongamia, or pongam oil tree (*Millettia pinnata* (L.) Panigrahi), is a fast-growing legume tree originally from India that can grow on unproductive land and is adaptable to a wide range of agro-climatic conditions. For more information on pongamia, consult the Ask IFAS publication ENH657, "[Pongamia pinnata: Pongam](#)." The tree belongs to the family Fabaceae and produces oval to flat seed pods with curved and pointed tips. It can adapt to elevated temperatures, high solar radiation, and arid environments (Rezazadeh 2022). In addition, the crop is

used in agricultural and environmental management. Studies have found pongamia to have the potential to grow as a restoration species in highly degraded forest areas and uptake nitrogen, water, and phosphorus (Biswas et al. 2011). Pongamia can fix about 47.4 mg of nitrogen per plant in 16 weeks under greenhouse conditions (Calica and Gresshoff 2019). Although pongamia is regarded as a drought-tolerant species with dense lateral root growth, the physiological traits that make the tree thrive under water-limited conditions are still poorly understood. Studies have reported that continuous water-limiting conditions for more than six months could negatively affect tree trunk diameter and height (Murphy et al. 2012), but drought thresholds have not been identified.

To cultivate more than two acres of a non-native species in Florida, it is necessary to obtain a permit from the [Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services](#) and follow their crop management best management practices. For more information about permitting, consult the Ask IFAS publication SS-AGR-453, "[Navigating the Non-Native Planting Rule: Permit Requirements for Large-Scale Plantings of Non-Native Species in Florida](#)." Pongamia best management practices, especially those related to water use, should be implemented to increase yields in new and established plantings; comply with the best management regulation to grow the crop in Florida; and promote environmental stewardship by reducing the use of water and nutrients.

Pongamia Water Consumption Considerations

The literature on water requirements for optimal seed and oil production of pongamia is limited, but experts state that irrigation is crucial during the establishment phase for dry tropical and subtropical areas (Usharani 2019). In a hot, semi-arid climate, 45 gallons per tree per month are recommended, and the average water consumption per gram of biomass is about 0.31 gallons (Chaturvedi et al. 1984). Although water consumption and crop coefficients (Kc) have been evaluated for several tree crops in Florida, there is no information available on the Kc of pongamia. The Kc coefficient indicates the water requirements of the tree. For more information on crop coefficients, consult the Ask IFAS publication AE456, "[Evapotranspiration-Based Irrigation for Agriculture: Crop Coefficients of Some Commercial Crops in Florida](#)."

Pongamia irrigation scheduling in Florida is currently based on citrus recommendations as a management baseline. For information on citrus irrigation guidelines, consult the Ask IFAS publication CPG12, "[Florida Citrus Production Guide: Irrigation Management of Citrus Trees](#)." Note that citrus may have higher water requirements than pongamia. Citrus crop coefficients range from 0.7 to 1.1, with an average water use of 165 gallons per tree per month (Morgan et al. 2006). Preliminary calculations have shown that young pongamia crop coefficients range from 0.4 to 0.9 at this growth stage (Figure 1). A lower crop coefficient means that the tree requires less water.




Figure 1. Calculated crop coefficient (Kc) for young pongamia trees in Florida in 2021–2022 (blue line) vs. crop coefficient for citrus trees in Florida (red line). Citrus coefficients were adapted from Kisekka et al. (2019).

Credit: Daniel Palacios-Linares, UF/IFAS

Irrigation Trial

In February 2021, soil moisture sensors were installed in a pongamia field trial at the UF/IFAS Indian River Research and Education Center to evaluate water management strategies for the crop (Figure 2a–b). The trial consisted of three rows, each with 30 trees, representing different irrigation scheduling systems: SM-based, ET-based, and GR-based (citrus irrigation).

The SM-based irrigation schedules were initially calculated using soil water thresholds obtained from the [Web Soil Survey](#) and were later adjusted based on in-field sensor data. The field capacity threshold was adjusted following sensor installation and an irrigation event that led to soil saturation. After the irrigation event, when the sensor readings slowed down below the saturation peak, we obtained the practical field capacity. This value was then compared with the results obtained from gravimetric soil sampling. For more information on how to practically determine soil field capacity using soil moisture readings, consult the Ask IFAS publication AE460, "[Interpretation of Soil Moisture Content to Determine Soil Field Capacity and Avoid Over-Irrigating Sandy Soils Using Soil Moisture Sensors](#)." The evaluated soil was Pineda sand, with a field capacity of 10.5% and a permanent wilting point of 3.8%. The ET-based schedules were calculated using the Penman-Monteith equation, based on the average of the previous 48 hours, and real-time data were collected from a weather station located at the trial site (Figure 2c). For

more information on how to calculate evapotranspiration using the Penman-Monteith equation, refer to the Ask IFAS publication AE446, "[Smart Irrigation Controllers: Operation of Evapotranspiration-Based Controllers](#)." The GR-based schedules were set at a fixed schedule of two hours of irrigation three times per week. The trial used the same irrigation infrastructure and land configuration as typical citrus lands, with a micro-sprinkler irrigation system delivering 10.5 gallons/h at 20 psi. Each tree was irrigated by a single emitter located 1 ft from the trunk, and the trees were spaced 8 ft apart. In-field soil and weather sensors were connected to a datalogger and a solenoid valve to automatically control irrigation for each row.



Figure 2. Field trial located at the UF/IFAS Indian River Research and Education Center (UF/IFAS IRREC) in Fort Pierce, FL. (A) Two-year-old pongamia trees at the UF/IFAS IRREC field trial. (B) Installation of a soil moisture sensor in proximity to pongamia roots. (C) Weather station that measures evapotranspiration and transfers the data to a computer server.

Credit: Daniel Palacios, UF/IFAS

Results

Water Use

In 2021, the SM-based and ET-based irrigation scheduling methods showed water savings of 23.3% and 23.9%, respectively, compared to the GR-based irrigation schedule (Table 1). Similarly, in 2022, the SM-based and ET-based irrigation scheduling methods showed water savings of 34.5% and 21.6%, respectively, compared to the GR-based irrigation schedule (Table 1). Figure 3 illustrates the volumetric water content (VWC) for each irrigation scheduling method. The SM-based (blue line) and ET-based (red line) methods show VWCs within the soil water-holding capacity thresholds and more frequent but shorter irrigations. The GR-based method indicates soil saturation (VWC > 20% in Figure 3) and an irrigation volume that exceeds the soil's capacity to retain water. To optimize irrigation and maintain soil water availability for the trees, we recommend using SM- or ET-based methods, as they help irrigation managers irrigate more frequently and for shorter periods. For more details on how to interpret soil moisture content, refer to the Ask IFAS publication AE460, "[Interpretation of Soil Moisture Content to Determine Soil Field Capacity and Avoid Over-Irrigating Sandy Soils Using Soil Moisture Sensors](#)."




Figure 3. Volumetric soil water content for soil moisture-based (SM, blue line), evapotranspiration-based (ET, red line), and calendar-based (GR, green line) irrigation scheduling of young pongamia trees from March 19, 2022, to April 19, 2022.

Credit: Daniel Palacios, UF/IFAS

Pongamia Physiological Responses per Irrigation Scheduling Method

The analysis of physiological development variables showed differences among irrigation methods. Specifically, the GR-based treatment showed significant differences in trunk diameter compared to the SM-based treatment. However, no significant differences were found

between the GR-based and ET-based treatments. In terms of stomatal conductance, a significant distinction was observed between the ET-based and the SM-based methods, while no significant differences were noted between the SM-based and GR-based methods. Conversely, for transpiration rate, there was a significant difference between the SM-based and the ET-based and GR-based schedules. Despite the reduced water volume applied in the SM-based schedule, which resulted in lower stomatal conductance, there were no substantial differences in the rate of carbon exchange among the treatments. This indicates that lower rates of transpiration and stomatal conductance do not interfere with the tree's physiological development. A 20% reduction in water application from the GR-based scheduling method appears viable for young trees without compromising tree and root growth at this early stage.

It is important to consider the impact of frequent rainstorms, extreme weather events, and water-table elevation when determining the best water management practices. Moreover, the management of pongamia pods is crucial to prevent them from entering waterways and causing potential environmental risks. This study, although still in its early stages, demonstrates that pongamia young trees can thrive with a reduction in water application of over 20%. Either soil moisture- or evapotranspiration-based irrigation scheduling is recommended to promote healthy canopy and root growth, reduce environmental impacts, and minimize nutrient losses.

References and Additional Resources

- Biswas, B., P. T. Scott, and P. M. Gresshoff. 2011. "Tree Legumes as Feedstock for Sustainable Biofuel Production: Opportunities and Challenges." *Journal of Plant Physiology* 168 (16): 1877–1884. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jplph.2011.05.015>
- Calica, P. N., and P. M. Gresshoff. 2019. "Comparative Assessment of Biological Nitrogen Fixation in *Pongamia pinnata*, a Biofuel Legume Tree." *Philippine Agricultural Scientist* 102 (1): 17–26.
- Chaturvedi, A. N., S. C. Sharma, and R. Srivastava. 1984. "Water Consumption and Biomass Production of Some Forest Trees." *The Commonwealth Forestry Review* 63 (3): 217–223. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42606415>
- Degani, E., M. Prasad, A. Paradkar, R. Pena, A. Soltangheisi, I. Ullah, B. Warr, and M. Tibbett. 2022. "A Critical Review of *Pongamia pinnata* multiplea: From Land Remediation and Carbon Sequestration to Socioeconomic Benefits." *Journal of Environmental Management* 324:116297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.116297>
- Dukes, M. D., M. L. Shedd, and S. L. Davis. 2022. "Smart Irrigation Controllers: Operation of Evapotranspiration-Based Controllers." AE446. Gainesville: University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. <https://ask.ifas.ufl.edu/publication/AE446>
- Garg, K. K., S. P. Wani, and A. V. R. K. Rao. 2014. "Crop Coefficients of *Jatropha* (*Jatropha curcas*) and *Pongamia* (*Pongamia pinnata*) Using Water Balance Approach." *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Energy and Environment* 3 (3): 301–309. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wene.88>
- Gilman, E. F., D. G. Watson, R. W. Klein, A. K. Koeser, D. R. Hilbert, and D. C. McLean. 2019. "*Pongamia pinnata*: Pongam." ENH657. Gainesville: University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. <https://ask.ifas.ufl.edu/publication/ST498>
- Herrera, E., S. M. Guzmán, and E. Murcia. 2021. "Common Questions When Using Soil Moisture Sensors for Citrus and Other Fruit Trees: AE551, 02/2021." *EDIS* 2021 (2): 4. <https://doi.org/10.32473/EDIS-ae551-2021>
- Kadyampakeni, D. M., K. T. Morgan, M. Zekri, A. W. Schumann, S. Guzmán, F. Alferez, and T. A. Obreza. 2022. "2022–2023 Florida Citrus Production Guide: Irrigation Management of Citrus Trees: CPG Ch. 15, CG093/CPG12, Rev. 4/2022." *EDIS* 2022 (CPG). <https://doi.org/10.32473/EDIS-cg093-2022>
- Kisekka, I., K. W. Migliaccio, M. D. Dukes, J. H. Crane, B. Schaffer, S. M. Guzmán, and H. K. Bayabil. 2019. "Evapotranspiration-Based Irrigation for Agriculture: Crop Coefficients of Some Commercial Crops in Florida: AE456/AE456, Rev. 6/2019." *EDIS* 2019 (3). <https://doi.org/10.32473/EDIS-ae456-2010>
- Lieurance, D., E. Rohrig, and S. Enloe. 2021. "Navigating the Non-Native Planting Rule: Permit Requirements for Large-Scale Plantings of Non-Native Species in Florida: SS-AGR-453/AG454, 06/2021." *EDIS* 2021 (3). <https://doi.org/10.32473/EDIS-ag454-2021>

- Morgan, K. T., T. A. Obreza, J. M. Scholberg, L. R. Parsons, and T. A. Wheaton. 2006. "Citrus Water Uptake Dynamics on a Sandy Florida Entisol." *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 70 (1): 90–97. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2005.0016>
- Murphy, H. T., D. A. O'Connell, G. Seaton, R. J. Raison, L. C. Rodriguez, A. L. Braid, D. J. Kriticos, T. Jovanovic, A. Abadi, M. Betar, H. Brodie, M. Lamont, M. McKay, G. Muirhead, J. Plummer, N. L. Arpiwi, B. Ruddle, S. Saxena, P. T. Scott, C. Stucley, B. Thistlethwaite, B. Wheaton, P. Wylie, and P. M. Gresshoff. 2012. "A Common View of the Opportunities, Challenges, and Research Actions for Pongamia in Australia." *Bioenergy Research* 5:778–800. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12155-012-9190-6>
- Rezazadeh, A. 2022. "Pongamia: An Alternative Crop with Great Potential in Florida." *Specialty Crop Industry Magazine*. <https://specialtycropindustry.com/pongamia-an-alternative-crop-with-great-potential-in-florida/>
- UF/IFAS. 2022. "Assessment of Non-Native Plants in Florida's Natural Areas: *Millettia pinnata*." <https://assessment.ifas.ufl.edu/assessments/millettia-pinnata/>
- Usharani, K. V., D. Naik, and R. L. Manjunatha. 2019. "Pongamia pinnata (L.): Composition and Advantages in Agriculture: A Review." *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry* 8 (3): 2181–2187.
- Zotarelli, L., M. D. Dukes, and K. T. Morgan. 2019. "Interpretation of Soil Moisture Content to Determine Soil Field Capacity and Avoid Over-Irrigating Sandy Soils Using Soil Moisture Sensors." AE460. Gainesville: University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. <https://ask.ifas.ufl.edu/publication/AE460>

Table 1. Summary of annual water applied per treatment.

Year	Treatment	Irrigation (hours)	Gallons/year/tree
2021	SM	77	808
	ET	76	803
	GR	100	1,055
2022	SM	97	1,018
	ET	116	1,218
	GR	148	1,554

SM: Soil moisture-based irrigation schedule.

ET: Evapotranspiration-based irrigation schedule.

GR: Current irrigation schedule based on citrus tree irrigation schedules.

¹This document is AE590, one of a series of the UF/IFAS Department of Agricultural and Biological Engineering. Original publication date November 2023. Revised August 2026. Visit the Ask IFAS website at <https://ask.ifas.ufl.edu/> for the currently supported version of this publication.

²Daniel Palacios-Linares, graduate research assistant, Department of Agricultural and Biological Engineering, UF/IFAS Indian River Research and Education Center, Ft. Pierce, FL; Sandra M. Guzmán, associate professor, water resources, Department of Agricultural and Biological Engineering, UF/IFAS Indian River Research and Education Center; Amir Rezazadeh, Extension agent II, Ph.D., fruit/field crops, UF/IFAS Extension St. Lucie County, Ft. Pierce, FL; Liliana M. Cano, assistant professor, Department of Plant Pathology, UF/IFAS Indian River Research and Education Center; Lorenzo Rossi, associate professor, root biology and rhizosphere ecology, Department of Horticultural Sciences, UF/IFAS Indian River Research and Education Center; Alan L. Wright, professor emeritus, Department of Soil, Water, and Ecosystem Sciences, UF/IFAS Indian River Research and Education Center; UF/IFAS Extension, Gainesville, FL 32611.

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS) is an Equal Opportunity Institution authorized to provide research, educational information, and other services only to individuals and institutions that operate in compliance with applicable federal and state non-discrimination laws and policies. For more information on obtaining other UF/IFAS Extension publications, contact your county's UF/IFAS Extension office. U.S. Department of Agriculture, UF/IFAS Extension Service, University of Florida, IFAS, Florida A&M University Cooperative Extension Program, and Boards of County Commissioners Cooperating. Andra Johnson, Dean for UF/IFAS Extension.