

FIELD TESTIMONIAL — EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

President Water Vortex Devices | Customer Field Interview

Grower	LeAnn Demasi
Operation	Pumpkin Farmer (5 crop rotations annually)
Location	Donnybrook, Western Australia
Interviewer	Jody Spencer, President Water Vortex
Format	Unedited, full-length field interview (~20 min)

Overview

LeAnn Demasi, a pumpkin grower in Donnybrook, Western Australia, trialled a President Water Vortex unit on one of her five annual pumpkin plantings this season. The trial was deliberately run as a stress test: the vortex was "pushed to its max" with no supplemental nitrogen applied, to isolate and measure the device's real contribution to plant nutrition, water efficiency, and disease pressure.

Trial Approach

- Pre-plant: standard slow-release granular fertiliser applied under the ground, as per normal practice.
- No nitrogen top-up applied post-planting — the vortex was relied on exclusively to supply nitrogen through the growing cycle.
- Potassium and phosphorus were added late in the season once fruit sizing lagged, to boost sugar development ahead of harvest.
- A directly comparable control paddock (no vortex) was irrigated and monitored side-by-side using the same protocols.

Key Results

- Water use: estimated at roughly half the volume required by the non-vortex control paddock, based on soil-probe monitoring and irrigation scheduling.
- Fertiliser: full crop grown to near-market spec with zero applied nitrogen; only late-stage potassium/phosphorus was needed to correct final fruit sizing and sugar content.
- Crop outcome: yield met commercial size specification for major retail buyers (1–2 kg fruit for supply via market agent to Coles); fruit were slightly under target sugar levels, attributed to the deliberately minimal fertiliser regime rather than the device.
- Spray regime: reduced from a strict 14-day cycle, with sprays alternated between conventional and biological products; grower attributes lower spray need to healthier, less-stressed plants.
- Plant vigour: an unplanned post-interview walk-through found plants still actively flowering and setting new fruit roughly a month after water and fertiliser inputs had stopped — behaviour the grower had not observed in prior seasons.
- Water source: an on-farm dam retained water later into the season than typical for this time of year, supporting a secondary turnip and swede planting that would not normally have been possible.

Grower Assessment

"As far as I was concerned, the vortex was born as a tool ... to see how far we can save money in fertilizer and to see what results we can get."

"The less water ... the plant is healthier ... statistically less disease, so less water, less spray."

"Would I use vortex again? Yes. Would I use vortex on other crops? Yes. Would I recommend it to others? I would."

Grower's Interpretation

Demasi frames the results within a broader philosophy of farming "the medium between organic and non-organic" — using tools like the vortex to reduce chemical and water inputs while remaining commercially viable. She reports that healthier, less water-stressed plants appear to correlate with reduced disease pressure and lower spray requirements, though she is careful to note this trial was intentionally aggressive (minimal fertiliser) and not a controlled scientific comparison.

Stated Interest Going Forward

- Plans to trial the vortex on pear trees next season.
- Interested in testing suitability for red apple varieties, pending clarification of which nitrogen form the device produces.
- Sees applicability beyond broadacre cropping, including home garden use and potential hydroponic/greenhouse settings.

Caveats

This is a single-season, single-grower, non-replicated trial conducted under deliberately extreme conditions (no supplemental nitrogen). Water-saving and yield figures are grower estimates from field observation and soil-probe monitoring rather than metered or independently verified data. Results should be read as directional field evidence rather than controlled agronomic proof.